

E 435

.C66

FLS  
2015  
011176

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005025175







11-109



THE

# FREEMAN'S MANUAL;

A BOOK OF

PRINCIPLES AND FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE,

AND

ESPECIALLY ADAPTED

TO THE USE OF

REPUBLICAN SPEAKERS AND ORATORS.

BY I. CODDING.

PRINTED BY

WRIGHT, MEDILL, DAY & CO., TRIBUNE OFFICE.

1856.

~~E 435~~  
~~C 66~~

E 435  
C 66

## P R E F A C E.

---

It is the simple design of this little work to put in a condensed form, and easy of reference, the *principles, facts and authorities* most required in the Republican argument, and best adapted to refute the *Slavoeratic* party against which we are contending. These facts and authorities are scattered over a wide field, and to gather them and condense them requires knowledge, time and skill. It cannot be expected that each person can do it for himself, in a satisfactory manner. The undersigned is fully aware that more time at command would have enabled him to have performed his task more to his own mind, and therefore more acceptably. But he flatters himself that, in putting out this "hand-book," he has done some service to a cause in which he has long taken a deep and increasing interest.

I. C.





## CHAPTER I.

*Are ALL men born with the inalienable rights of Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness?*

The late venerable John C. Calhoun declared, among the last acts of his life, that if the American Declaration of rights were true, the South ought not to labor for the extension of slavery, but should rather curtail it where it did exist. "But," he added, "*it is NOT true.*" Chancellor Harper says, in an essay on this subject read, a few years ago before a Charleston (S. C.) audience, "It is as much in the order of nature and of God that men should enslave each other as that animals should prey upon each other."

The Southern press is now taking this ground generally. The following is taken from a recent number of the Charleston (S. C.) *Mercury* :

"NONE CAN CONSISTENTLY OR EFFECTIVELY CONTEND FOR STATE EQUALITY who do not hold that the institutions of the South are equally *rightful, legitimate, moral and promotive of human happiness and well-being with those of the North.*"

Senator Petit, of Indiana, in the Congressional debates of 1850, declared that the declaration of the equality of human rights "*is a self-evident lie.*"

Senator Douglas, in his Fourth of July speech at Philadelphia, 1854, said it was a declaration of the rights of the colonies or confederate States as against Great Britain. So down to such Pro-Slavery Douglas journeymen as our *McConnells'* and *Davidsons*, and even such apprentices as our *Holloways*, "the declaration of human equality is denied."

This denial practically constitutes the basis of the Pro-Slavery party, and many of its leading minds are open and frank in its public avowal.

In opposition to these sectional and aristocratic views, the Republicans hold with the fathers. The original draught of the American Declaration, as it came from the hand of Thomas Jefferson, contained the following eloquent clause touching the slave trade :

"He (the King of England) has waged a cruel war against *human nature* itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him ; captivating and carrying them into

The supreme court of Mississippi has declared :

"We view *this*, (the condition of slavery) as a right existing by *positive law*, of a municipal character, without foundation in the law of nature or in the unwritten or common law."—*Rankin vs. Lydia*, 2 *Marshall*, p. 479,

The supreme court of Missouri has declared :

"Slavery is condemned by reason and the law of nature. It exists and can exist, only through municipal regulations."—*Harry vs. Decker, Walker's R.* p. 42

The supreme court of Louisiana has declared :

"The relation of owner and slave is, in the States of the Union in which it has legal existence, a creature of municipal law. Although, perhaps, in none of them a statute introducing it as to the blacks can be produced, it is believed that in all statutes were passed for regulating and dissolving it."—114 *Martin's Louisiana Reports*.

Any clause in the Constitution which should sanction or support slavery must be as marked and exceptional in that instrument as is the institution itself in a republican form of Government. Do we find any such language in the Constitution? So far otherwise that the very word "*slave*" was not allowed to pollute that sacred instrument. There is not a single word in that noble charter of our liberties which gives to Congress the power to make a slave any more than to make a king. In the absence of all language in the Constitution conveying, in the remotest sense, the idea that there can be property in a human being, we have the most explicit declaration of its principles, which forbid such a possibility.

In the preamble of the Constitution we find proclaimed in the following decisive language, the grand design of the people of the United States :

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of LIBERTY to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

Thus, by unmistakable language, the Constitution was ordained, *not to promote, sanction, or secure, slavery; not to make slavery national; but to "establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty."*

In perfect keeping with this design of the people of the United States, as set forth in the preamble of the Constitution, is the fifth Article of the Amendments.

The history of this Article is significant.

The following amendment was proposed by Virginia :

"No *freeman* ought to be taken, imprisoned or disseized of his freehold, liberties, or franchises, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed or deprived of his life, liberty or property, *but by the law of the land.*"—3 *Elliot's Debates*, 658.

Did Congress adopt this proposition and recommend it to the people? The amendment which they adopted and recommended, and which now forms part of the Constitution, was more consonant with the tone of the instrument, and more in accordance with the spirit of the time.

*No person \* \* \* shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, but by due process of law.*—*Con., Amendt., Art. V.*

Mark the significant substitution of the word "*person*" for *freeman!*" This amendment alone, rightly interpreted and applied, would be competent to prevent the introduction of slavery into any territory acquired by the United States.

In harmony with this interpretation of the Constitution are the contemporaneous declarations made in the Constitutional Convention, and elsewhere shedding a clear light upon the meaning of the word "*person*," under which, if at all, slaves are alluded to in the Constitution. Early in the convention Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, declared that he never would aid in upholding slavery; it was the curse of Heaven in the State where it prevailed."

Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, said "the morality or wisdom of slavery are considerations belonging to the States themselves."

From Mr. Madison's report we gather the following declarations, made during the discussions of the clause relating to the African slave trade.

"Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, said that 'we have nothing to do with the conduct of the States touching slavery; *but we ought to be careful and not give any sanction to it.*'

"Roger Sherman 'was opposed to any tax on slaves imported, as making the matter worse, *because it implied that they were property.*'

"After debate the subject was committed to a committee of eleven, who subsequently reported a substitute, authorizing a tax on such migration or importation at a rate not exceeding the average duties on imports."

This language, classifying persons with merchandize, seemed to imply a recognition that they were property. Mr. Sherman at once declared himself against 'that part acknowledging men to be property—by taxing them as such, under their character, as slaves.'

"Mr. Madison 'thought it wrong to admit, in the Constitution, the idea that there could be property in men.'"

"It was finally agreed to make the clause read—'but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.'

This record clearly demonstrates that the word "*person*" was substituted for phrases implying property, in order to exclude from the Constitution the idea that there can be property in human beings, and to show that slaves were ever to be considered persons. In the first Congress under the Constitution this was understood. A motion



being under consideration to introduce into the import bill a duty on the importation of slaves, Roger Sherman, declared that 'the Constitution does not consider these persons as property; it speaks of them as *persons*.' "

John Jay, in the "Federalist," says: 'Let the case of the slaves be considered as it is in truth—a peculiar one, let the compromising expedients of the Constitution be mutually adopted, which regard them as inhabitants but as based below the equal level of free inhabitants, which regard the slave as divested of two-fifths of the man.'

Three-fifths then of manhood remain to the slave!

One record more from the Madison papers:—

"Aug. 28, 1787. Mr. Butler and Mr. Pickney moved to require fugitive slaves and servants to be delivered up like convicts.

"Mr. Wilson said, this would oblige the executive of State to do it at public expense.

"Mr. Sherman saw no more propriety in the seizing and surrendering the slave, or servant, than a horse. Mr. Butler withdrew his proposition in order that some particular provision might be made apart from this article.

"August 17, '87, Mr. Butler moved to insert, 'If any person bound to service or labor in any of the United States shall escape into another State, he or she shall not be discharged from such service by any regulation subsisting in the State to which they escape, but shall be delivered up to the person *justly* claiming their service or labor.'

"After the engrossment, Sept. 15th, the term 'legally' was stricken from the third paragraph of Sec. 2d, Article 4, and the words "under the laws thereof" inserted after the word "State," in compliance with the wishes of some who thought the term "legally" to be equivocal, and to favor the idea that slavery was legal in a *moral view*."—*Madison's Debates*, p. 487, 402.

A distinguished living statesman, in a speech, made in the Senate of the United States, in 1850, remarks:

"The Constitution does not expressly affirm anything on the subject [of slavery!]; all it contains is two incidental allusions to slavery. These are first in the provision establishing a ratio of representation and taxation; and secondly in the provision relating to fugitives from labor. In both cases the Constitution mentions slaves, *not as slaves*, much less as chattles; but as *persons*. That the recognition of them as persons was designed, is historically recorded and I think was never denied."

As the Keystone to this argument, we quote the opinion of a learned judge of the supreme bench, Mr. Justice McLean:

"If slaves are considered in some of the states as merchandize, that cannot divest them of the leading quality of *persons* by which they are designated in the constitution,

The character of property is given to them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities;

but the constitution *acts upon slaves as persons* and *not as slaves*, therefore slavery is local in its character and in its effects."—*Groves vs. Slaughter*, 15 *Peter's*, p. 599.

Thus, a fair interpretation of the Constitution would be equal to a prohibitory law in all territory of the United States. Hence, that interpretation of Douglas' Kansas-Nebraska bill, which gives to the people of a territory power to introduce slavery, is not only barbarous, but in flat contradiction with the Constitution.

But in the absence of any judicial decision in any case involving the whole question, it becomes necessary to have a prohibitory law of Congress. Such law, so far from being a violation of the Constitution, would be but carrying out its letter and spirit."—*Coddington's Speech versus Douglas*.

The following are the only clauses in the Constitution which can be made to recognize slavery. Below we copy remarks upon them, from Dr. Bailey of the *National Era* as pertinent to our purpose under this head. If our opponents confine themselves to the letter of the clause, they find no slavery; if they ask for the spirit and intention as settled by the Constitution and contemporaneous history, then they must adopt our interpretation. In either case they are wrong.

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned, among the several States which may be embraced within this Union, according to their respective number, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, *three-fifths of all other persons*."—*Art. 1, sec. 2, Con. U. S.*

1. "The migration or importation of *such persons* as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808; but a tax may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars a head."—*Con. U. S., Art. 4, Sec. 9.*

3. "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."—*Con. U. S., Art. 4, Sec. 11.*

"As confirming our views, as illustrating the intention of those who framed the Federal Constitution, and the opinions of Madison, a recognized authority with Southern statesmen, and as incidental though forcible testimony to the soundness of the position assailed by the *Sentinel*, we shall close this article by quoting freely from a debate which sprung up on the subject of the slave trade, in the first Congress under the Constitution.

The tariff bill having been reported in the House, in May, 1788, Mr. Parker, of Virginia, moved to insert a clause imposing a duty of ten dollars on every slave imported. He was sorry that Congress had not the power to stop the importation altogether. "It was *contrary to revolutionary principles*, and ought not to be permitted." Smith, of South Carolina, with characteristic jealousy of Federal



interposition, opposed the motion. Sherman of Connecticut, favored the object of the motion, but did not think it a fit subject to be embraced in the bill. "He could not reconcile himself to the insertion of *human beings, as a subject of impost, among goods, wares, and merchandise.*" He hoped the motion would be withdrawn for the present, and taken up afterwards as an independent subject.

Jackson, of Georgia, opposed the motion, charged Virginia with selfishness in her labors to suppress the slave trade, hoped the gentleman would withdraw his motion, and that, should it be brought forward again, "it might comprehend the white slave (as well as the black) imported from all the jails of Europe."

Parker persisted in his motion. "He hoped Congress would do all in their power to restore to *human nature its inherent privileges*; to wipe off if possible, the stigma under which America laboured; to do away the *inconsistency of our principles*, justly charged upon us; and to show by our actions, the *pure beneficence of the doctrines held out to the world in our Declaration of Independence.*

Ames, of Massachusetts, "detested Slavery from his soul; but he had some doubts whether imposing a duty on their importation would not have an appearance of countenancing the practice."

At this juncture, Mr. Madison, who had taken a leading part in the construction of the Constitution, came to the support of the motion of his colleague in a powerful speech. Read some extraets from it, and say whether the Virginia statesman, a fair representative at that time of the "father of the Republic," regarded Slaves or Slavery as the *Sentinel* and its associates now do, [as the Pierce and Douglas Democracy now do,] or rather, whether his views do not confirm those presented in the *Era* :

"The confounding men with merchandise," he said, "might be easily avoided, by altering the title of the bill; it was in fact the very object of the motion, to *prevent*, men so far as the power of Congress extended, from being confounded with merchandise. The clause in the Constitution allowing a tax to be imposed, though the trafic, could not be *prohibited* for twenty years, was inserted, he believed, for the very purpose of enabling Congress to give some testimony of the sense of America with respect to the African trade.

"By expressing a national disapprobation of the trade, it is to be hoped we may *destroy* it, and so save ourselves *From reproach* and our posterity from the imbecility ever attendaent on a country filled with slaves.

"This was as much the interest of South Carolina and Georgia as any other states. Every addition they received to their number of Slaves, tended to weakness, and rendered them less capable of self defence. In case of hostilities with foreign nations, their slave population would be a means, not of repelling, but of inviting attack. It was the duty of the General Government to protect



every part of the Union against dangers, as well internal as external.

"Everything, therefore, that tended to increase this danger, though it might be a local affair, yet if it involved national expense or safety, became of concern to every part of the union, and a proper subject for the consideration of those charged with the general administration of the government."

"Bland, of Virginia, was no less decided in his support of the motion.

"Burk suggested that, if not particularly named, slaves would still fall under the general five per cent. ad valorem duty on all unenumerated articles.

"Madison replied, that no collector of the customs would presume to apply the terms goods, wares and merchandise to persons; and in this he was supported by Sherman, who denied that persons were recognized anywhere in the Constitution as property. He thought that the clause in the Constitution on which the present motion was founded applied as much to other persons as to slaves, and that there were other persons to whom it ought to be applied, as convicts, for instance; but the whole subject ought to be taken up by itself. Finally, upon Madison's suggestion, Parker consented to withdraw his motion, with the understanding that a separate bill should be brought in."

---

### CHAPTER III.

*The General Government has uniformly refused to pay for Slaves as property till a recent date.*

Up to 1818 no report favorable to the idea that the *Constitution sanctions the right of property in man was ever made*, and never was there a *deliberate* vote given by Congress to pay the public money for *slaves* as property.\* till after that date.

"In the year 1830, the Register of the Treasury declared that no instance of the payment for slaves during the Revolution, was to be found on record. No, sir; Madison and Jefferson were then living." But many were hired or impressed, and lost during the Revolution.

It is stated, on good authority, that the first attempt to make this government pay for *slaves* was in 1816. I give the statement in Mr. Giddings' own words.

"After the close of the late war with England, a bill was pending in this House, providing for the payment for property lost or

---

\*Most of the facts under this head were obtained from Giddings' Speech on "Payment for Slaves," delivered in Congress Dec. 28, 1848.

destroyed during that war. When the section providing for the payment for horses, earts, etc., which were impressed into public service and destroyed, was under consideration, Mr. Maryant, from South Carolina, moved to amend the bill so as to embrace *slaves*.

The motion was opposed by Mr. Yancy and Mr. Robertson, and was negatived by a large majority.\* That was a motion so to amend the bill as to pay for slaves, "if killed in the public service, when they had been *impressed*."

The following, from the Committee on Claims of the Senate (vide Rep. H. R. 401, 1st Session 21st Congress,) will show the nature of one of the specifications to sustain the amendment which was lost as above.

"The eart, horse, and negro man, Antoine, belonging to the petitioner, were impressed, and sent to the lines of the American army, on the first day of January, 1815, where the negro *man* was killed by a cannon ball from the British batteries." The petitioner was paid for his *property*, viz: the horse and eart, but not for the "*Negro man*."

"The next case," says Mr. Giddings, "was that of D'Auterive. He had claims against the United States for wood and other necessities furnished the army, and for the loss of time and expense of nursing a slave who was wounded in the service of government at New Orleans. This case is more interesting from the fact, that there was at that time an attempt, as on the present occasion, to *break down that well known principle in our Constitution that "slaves are persons and not property."*

The Committee on Claims, at that time (1828), was composed of four Northern men and three Southern. \* \* That committee reported in favor of allowing eompensation for the articles furnished to the army, but said, expressly, that "SLAVES NOT BEING PROPERTY, they could NOT allow the master *any compensation for his loss*." This was the unanimous report. Mr. Williams of North Carolina, Mr. McCoy of Virginia and Mr. Owen of Alabama uniting in the report. \* \* \* "They (the gentlemen from the South) made a strenuous effort to reverse the decision of the Committee on Claims; but after some two weeks' discussion, gave it up, laid the subject on the table, and there the matter ended."

Thus *on full discussion*, thirty-nine years after the adoption of the Constitution, the doctrine that the Constitution does not recognize property in MEN was *re-affirmed* by Congress.

The next instance of an effort to appropriate the treasure of the nation to pay for slaves, was in 1843.

"A bill for the relief of the people of West Florida," says Mr. Giddings, in the same speech, intended to provide for the payment of slaves taken by the army of Gen. Jackson from the inhabitants

\*See National Intelligencer, Dec. 28, 1816.



of that territory, in 1814, came up for discussion. The slaves had been taken, against the consent of their owners, by the military power of the nation. I think that there were about ninety taken from different individuals. The proposition was distinct in its character. The object of the bill was to pay for human flesh. I, myself, opened the debate, and stated, as the principal grounds of my opposition to it, that *slaves were not regarded as property under the Federal Constitution*. My venerable and lamented friend, now no more, (John Quincy Adams,) *sustained my position*. Several Southern gentlemen spoke in favor of the bill. The journal is now before me, and shows the bill to have been rejected, by a vote of *one hundred and thirteen to thirty-six*."

The next case came up in 1848. The following is a synopsis of the facts involved in the case :

"The claimant, in 1835, residing in Florida, professed to own a Negro man named Lewis; this man is said to have been very intelligent, speaking four different languages, which he read and wrote with facility. The master hired him to an officer of the United States, to act as a guide to the troops under the command of Maj. Dade, for which he was to have twenty-five dollars per month. The duties were dangerous and the price proportioned to the danger. At the time these troops were massacred, this slave, Lewis, deserted to the enemy, or was captured by them. He remained with the Indians, acting with them in their depredations against the white people, until 1837; when, General Jessup says, *he was captured by a detachment of troops under his command*. An Indian Chief, named Jumper, surrendered with Lewis, whom he claimed as a slave, having, as he said, captured him at the time of Dade's defeat. General Jessup declares that he regarded him as a dangerous man; that he was supposed to have kept up a correspondence with the enemy from the time he joined Major Dade until the defeat of that officer; that to insure the public safety, he ordered him sent west with the Indians, believing that if left in the country he would be employed against our troops.

"He was sent west, and the claimant now asks that we shall pay him a thousand dollars as the value of this man's body."

To show the progress of the slave power, I will mention that the Committee on Military affairs could not agree. Five slave-holders, representing slave property, reported a bill for the payment of the \$1,000 claimed. Four Northern members of the Committee, representing the interest of *national freedom*, reported against the bill of the majority. The bill of the majority passed the House, but was never revived in the Senate.

Up to 1848, the treasure of the nation was never *deliberately* voted to pay for slaves. The uniform practice of the country has been, up to that time, no payment for slaves with the public treasury. Since that time the policy of the nation has been gradually

changing under the Calhoun dogma, that slaves are just as legitimately property under the Constitution of the United States as are horses.

This principle has been fully endorsed under Pierce's Administration.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

*The power of the General Government to prohibit slavery in the U. S. Territory, never to any extent denied till 1818, and not repudiated by the Democratic Party till 1854.*

### JEFFERSON'S PROVISIO OF '84

The first acquisition of territory by the United States was made some three years before the adoption of the Constitution. This territory was acquired from the cessions of Virginia, New York and Connecticut. It was the territory north and west of the Ohio river. Congress immediately proceeded to consider the question of its government.

Slavery was already there under the French colonial law, and also under the laws of Virginia, if the claim she set up was valid. Congress, proceeding to consider the subject of its government, appointed Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Howell and Mr. Chase, a committee to frame an ordinance for this object. The ordinance reported was the work of Mr. Jefferson, and is now to be seen in his own handwriting at Washington, and was so worded as to cover not only the territory north-west of the Ohio, which was already obtained, but all territory that should hereafter be acquired by cessions from other states. Prominent among the provisions of this ordinance was the following, to which I wish to call the particular attention of the reader :

"After the year 1800 of the Christian era, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States (which should be framed out of said territories) otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, of which parties shall have been duly convicted." This proviso, let it be remembered, applied to all the territory which we then possessed, or ever expected to possess ; for it was then thought unconstitutional to acquire foreign territory.

Mr. Speight, of N. Carolina, moved that it (the proviso) be stricken from the ordinance, and the vote stood for the proviso, six States—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania, against three States—Virginia, Maryland and North Carolina. Delaware and Georgia were not then



represented in Congress, and the vote of North Carolina, being divided, was not counted; nor was the vote of New Jersey counted, one delegate only being present. But you will observe that the States stood six to three. Of the twenty-three delegates present, sixteen were for the proviso and seven against it! The vote of the States was two to one, and that of the delegates more than two to one for the proviso. But under the provisions of the articles of confederation, which then controlled the legislation of Congress, the votes of a majority of all the States were necessary to retain the proviso in the ordinance. Had the principle of a democratic majority then prevailed, had the almost universal sentiments of the people of that time been respected, the question of slavery in this country, would then have been settled forever.

In 1787 the restrictive principle of Jefferson's Proviso of '84 was ingrafted into the ordinance, for the government of the territory north-west of the Ohio river.

ART. 6 OF THE "ORDINANCE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES, NORTH-WEST OF THE RIVER CHIO."

"There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted; provided, always, that any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully due in any one of the original States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed, and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid."—*Con. of the U. S., and other Documents by W. Hickey. 7th Edition page 429.*

This constituted *all the territory belonging at that time to the United States.*

It is sometimes said that this ordinance was passed by the old Congress prior to the adoption of the U. S. Constitution, and therefore does not possess much political significance. But it was ratified and "full effect" was given to it by the first Congress under the Constitution. And here I will name the men who were members of the Federal Convention which formed the Constitution, and also members of the first Congress under it.

John Langdon and Nicholas Gilman, of N. H.; Elbridge Gerry, Rufus King and Caleb Strong, of Massachusetts; Wm. J. Johnson Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth, of Conn.; Wm. Patterson, of New Jersey; George Read and Richard Basset, of Delaware; Daniel Carroll, of Maryland; JAMES MADISON, of Virginia; Hugh Williamson, of North Carolina; Pierce Butler, of South Carolina; Wm. Few and Abram Baldwin, of Georgia. George Washington was the presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention and was the first president of the United States, and signed an enactment adapting the Ordinance of '87 to the new state of things under the U. S. Constitution. The whole act was passed without a division. The preamble is as follows, and it will be seen endorses and gives "FULL EFFECT" to the Ordinance of '87—It was passed 7th August, 1789.

"Whereas, in order that the ordinance of the United States in Congress assembled, for the government of the Territory north-west of the river Ohio, *may continue to have FULL EFFECT*, it is requisite that certain provisions should be made so as to adapt the same to the present Constitution of the United States," &c.

Thus by this proviso, and its ratification by the first Congress under our Constitution, was every rood of U. S. Territory at that time possessed, consecrated *perpetually* to liberty, and the policy of excluding slavery from all national territory proclaimed and vindicated in the spirit of the Constitution, and in obedience to its principles. Indeed *slavery* being already in this territory, under the French colonial law, and according to the claim set up by Virginia, under *Virginia* law, the first application of this original policy of our government *actually* converted *slave* into *free* territory.

Before this time seven of the original States had taken measures for the abolition of slavery, and were regarded prospectively as free States, leaving six only as slave States. This ordinance provided for five additional free States, and in this manner secured the immense preponderance of the Free States in the government. The indefinite continuance of slavery in any of the States was evidently not then thought of.

This anti-slavery policy of the government was not even *technically* departed from till 1790, and was not *deliberately* infringed upon till 1820. In 1790, Congress accepted from North Carolina the cession of the territory which now constitutes Tennessee. North Carolina being aware that without stipulation to the contrary, slavery would be prohibited in said territory, according to the genius of the Constitution and the established policy of the government; introduced into the deed of cession an express provision that slavery should not be prohibited by the application of the ordinance of '87. Congress should have undoubtedly refused to accept this territory upon such conditions. But slavery had grown up there under the authority of an original State, and it was doubtless considered impolitic to overrule the wishes of the State and of the people in the ceded territory, for its continuance.

The acceptance by Congress of this cession from North Carolina, of the cession from Georgia of that portion of her Territory lying west of her limits and east of the Mississippi, without restriction; together with the introduction by Congress of the slave laws of Maryland into the district of Columbia, were acts repugnant to the Constitution, and in manifest departure from the original policy of the government. The spirit of gain had already begun to get the mastery over the spirit of liberty. Said Luther Martin, "When our own rights were at stake, we warmly felt for the COMMON RIGHTS of MAN. The danger being thought to be past, which threatened *ourselves*, we are *daily growing more insensible to THESE RIGHTS.*"

In 1803, Louisiana was acquired from France. In this case, as



in the case of the territory acquired from North Carolina and Georgia, Congress refrained from applying the anti-slavery proviso. Congress did not interfere with the slave territory then, but prohibited, absolutely, the introduction of slavery from beyond the limits of the United States, except by actual owners removing to Louisiana for settlement. Likewise, when Louisiana was admitted into the Union in 1812, no restriction was put upon her slavery.

The courts have always ruled that the Ordinance of '87 was constitutional and binding during the life, at least, of the territory.

The eighth section of the Missouri Act, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise, by *prohibiting forever* slavery or involuntary servitude, except for crime, above thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, was a solemn proclamation to the world that Congress had the constitutional power to prohibit slavery, not only, but to abolish it in United States territory. President Monroe, before signing this bill, asked for the opinions of his Cabinet, of which Calhoun, Crawford and J. Q. Adams were members; each of whom submitted *in writing* an opinion favorable to its constitutionality. Thus, more than thirty years after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the eagle-eyed Calhoun, the mightiest of the Southern extremists, declared his belief in the constitutional power of Congress to exclude slavery from United States territory, "purchased by the common treasury or common blood of the *slave* as well as the *free* States." The doctrine of non-intervention, as put forth by Gen. Cass, in his famous Nicholson letter, in '48, was rejected by the great mass of Democrats at that time. Isaac Hill, of the New Hampshire *Patriot*, the Atlas of Democracy in New England, on the 29th July, '48, speaking of the Squatter Sovereignty doctrine, as involved in that letter, says:

"*The Democracy of the North never did endorse the doctrine, and they NEVER WILL. The Democracy of this State are UNANIMOUS in the opinion, so far as we know, that Congress HAS and SHOULD EXERCISE the power, and exclude slavery from California and New Mexico.*"

The same high Democratic authority declared in his *Patriot*, in 1848: "The Southern people have no right, natural, moral or political, to enforce slavery upon the new territories. They have no more right to go there and hold slaves than they have to do so in New Hampshire. The slave-holders have no more right to plant slavery upon free territory than we have to abolish slavery in South Carolina."

In 1847 the New Hampshire Democratic Convention passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That we declare it is our solemn conviction, as the Democratic party have *heretofore done*, that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude should hereafter exist in any territory which may be acquired *by*, or annexed to the United States, and that we approve of the votes of our delegation in Congress in favor of the Wilmot Proviso.

## ACTION OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE IN 1848.

*Resolved*, By the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, that we are in favor of the passage of a law by Congress, forever prohibiting slavery in New Mexico and California, and in all other territories now acquired or hereafter to be acquired in which slavery does not exist at the time of such acquisition.

*Resolved*. By &c., "That opposed to every form of oppression, the people of New Hampshire have ever viewed with deep regret the existence of slavery in this Union. That while they have steadfastly supported all sections in their constitutional rights, they have not only lamented its existence as a great social evil, but have regarded it as fraught with danger to the peace and welfare of the nation."

*Resolved*, By &c., "That while we respect the rights of the slave-holding as well as the free portions of this Union—while we will not willingly consent that wrong be done to any member of this glorious confederacy to which we belong, we are firmly and UNALTERABLY opposed to the extension of Slavery over any portion of American soil now free."

*Resolved*, By &c., "That in our opinion Congress [has] the Constitutional power to [abolish] the slave trade and slavery in the District of Columbia; and that our Senators be instructed and our Representatives be requested to take all constitutional measures to accomplish these objects."

SAM'L. H. AYER, Speaker of H. Rep.      WM. S. WEEKS, Prest. Sen.  
SAMUEL DINSMORE, Governor.

In Concord, 5th June, as reported in the *New Hampshire Patriot*, 12th June, '45, Gen. Pierce (now President of U. S.) said that he had himself approached this subject [of annexation of Texas] with all his prejudices and prepossessions against it, and on one ground alone—its *slavery feature*. \* \* That the only difficulty in his mind ever had been, that of a recognition by any new act of the government of the institution of domestic slavery."

In 1851, in the New Hampshire Constitutional Convention, Gen. Pierce declared, as reported in the *New Hampshire Patriot*, "I would take the ground of the non-extension of slavery—that slavery should not become stronger. What single thing is there connected with it that is not obnoxious?"

We take the following from the *Chicago Democratic Press* of May 7, 1856:

"Now the Democratic party of Illinois have always held that Congress had the right to legislate upon slavery in the territories. While a member of that party, Judge Douglas wrote a letter, which was widely published, protesting, among other things, against an attempt to degrade Col. Benton from his position on the Senate Committees. We quote a paragraph or two from that letter:

'I desired to know whether Col. Benton was to be excluded merely because he believed that Congress possessed the power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in territories when opposed to the exercise of the power. *If so, the same rule would exclude me.* \* \* \* If Col. Benton was to be excluded on this account, the rule must be extended to all others, and hence a Democratic caucus would find itself in the sad predicament of prescribing a test of faith according to which no one of us would be competent to serve on committees as Democrats.' "



## OF THE MISSOURI RESTRICTION.

Thomas H. Benton, whose democracy was not called in question until 1854, and then only by Douglas, Atchison & Co., said :

"It was the highest, the most solemn, the most momentous, the most emphatic assertion of Congressional power over slavery in a territory which has ever been made or could be conceived. It not only prohibited it where it could be legally carried, but forever prohibited it where it had long existed."

Douglas and Shields both voted for the Wilmot proviso less than ten years ago, and Douglas has declared that Illinois could never have been admitted into the Union if she had not embodied in her constitution the ordinance of '87. He also moved the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific.

In his speech of 1850, Feb. 5th and 6th, Henry Clay said :

"I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote, to spread slavery where it does not exist."—*Life and Speeches of Henry Clay, Phil. Ed., p. 655.*

Said Daniel Webster, in 1848, of the advocates of slavery extension :

"I am afraid that the generation of doughfaces will be as perpetual as the generation of men. \* \* \* I think such persons are doughfaces, and dough-heads, and dough-souls, and they are *all* dough."

## WASHINGTON ON INTERVENTION.

Gen Washington, in a letter to Gen. La Fayette, in 1793, made use of the following language :

"I agree with you cordially in your views in regard to Negro slavery. I have long considered it a most serious evil, both socially and politically, and I should rejoice in any feasible scheme to rid our states of such a burden.

"The Congress of 1787 adopted an ordinance which prohibits the existence of involuntary servitude in our north-western territory forever. *I consider it a wise measure.* It met with the approval and assent of nearly every member from the States more immediately interested in slave labor. The prevailing opinion in Virginia is against *the spread of slavery into our new territories*, and I trust we shall have a confederacy of free States."

In June, 1836, the present Attorney General, Caleb Cushing, in a speech against the admission of Arkansas with a Constitution making slavery perpetual, said :

"I do not persuade myself that liberty is an evil, or slavery a blessing. Shall we be brutishly dumb when it is sought through us to render slavery perpetual in new States. I should be false to all the opinions and principles of my life, if I did not promptly return a peremptory and emphatic no! when called upon to accord my sanction to a form of Government which perpetuates Slavery."

Let me here add that Mr. Douglas had not abandoned the policy and power of slavery restriction by Congress, up to 7th June, 1854, when his bill for organizing Nebraska was published; for in that bill he declares :

“Your committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into those controverted questions. (The power of Congress to prohibit Slavery in the United States' Territory, etc.)

‘They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850.

“As Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matters in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws, or by an act declaring the true intent of the Constitution, and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the territories, so your committee are not prepared *now* to recommend a departure from the course pursued on that *memorable occasion*, either by *affirming* or *repealing* the eighth section of the Missouri act, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the Constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute.”

The power of Congress to say “no slavery outside of slave States,” which constitutes the present test question in the Republican ranks, was never abandoned by the so-called Democratic party till 1854. To hold to the faith of the nation, and to that of the so-called Democratic party up to 1854, incurs the epithet of “Black Republican.” Does any one, who knows how slowly physiological changes take place, believe the Pierce and Douglas Democracy have become white in a little over two years, and that, too, by abandoning the faith of the Jeffersonian, Jackson, and Van Buren Democracy, and by becoming the body-guard of the Black Power?

---

## CHAPTER V.

*Does the Free or Slave policy further the ends of good government—promote the intelligence, dignity and prosperity of the free laborer?*

President Pierce, in a recent message, stigmatized all Republicans as “enemies of the Constitution, who have surrendered themselves so far to a fanatical devotion to the supposed interests of the relatively *few Africans* in the United States, as *totally to abandon and disregard the interests of the TWENTY-FIVE MILLIONS OF AMERICANS, &c.*” The minions of the government denounce us as Black Republicans as tho’ our principles and measures were confined to the colored people exclusively. Let me now call the particular attention of the reader to a few facts which will make their own comments.

If slavery in the *slave States* bears unpropitiously upon every great end of good government,—upon population,—the value of the soil,—internal improvements—general intelligence—industrious and economical habits—inventions—the dignity of free labor and

military power; then it is for the interest of the "twenty-five millions" of *people of the United States*, and especially that of those who settle in Kansas, to keep it out of that territory.

The unthrift, decay and desolating adversity which has marked its career in the *older States*, are close on its heel in the *new*, and will not forsake it in Kansas. Slavery is unjust, and is therefore pregnant with retribution.

In 1790, the entire population of Virginia, was .....	748,308
" " " " " New York, was .....	310,120
In 1850 the total population of Virginia, was .....	1,421,661
" " " " " New York, was .....	3,099,394
Kentucky contains .....	37,680 square miles.
Ohio " .....	39,964 " "

Kentucky has as good a soil, a finer climate, and is washed by the great navigable rivers, Ohio and Mississippi.

In 1790 Kentucky had 73,079 inhabitants.

" " Ohio had not a white inhabitant.

In 1800 Kentucky had 220,959; Ohio 45,365.

In 1850 do had 982,405; Ohio 1,980,427.

At this time Kentucky has not 800,000 free men, while Ohio has over 2,000,000.

In 1810 Louisville had .....	4,012 persons.
" " Cincinnati had .....	9,644 "
" 1850 Louisville had less than .....	50,000 "
" " Cincinnati had over .....	150,000 "

The following we take from "The North and South," issued from the New York *Tribune* office in 1854, a most powerful pamphlet.—*See pp. 30, 31 and 32.*

"We beg our readers, now, to compare with us the relative position of Northern and Southern States and cities. Sixty years since, Virginia stood at the head of the Union, with ten representatives in Congress, while New York had only six. Where stand they now? New York has thirty-three and Virginia thirteen. Sixty years since, South Carolina had five representatives, while Ohio had scarcely a white inhabitant. Now the former has still her own number of five, while the latter has twenty-one. In that time Massachusetts has grown from eight to eleven; Pennsylvania from eight to twenty-five, and even little New Jersey, which then had only four, now balances the State which furnishes the great aristocracy of the land in its Pinckneys, Rutledges, Cheveses and Gadsdens. At that time, this city, Norfolk and Charleston might fairly have disputed the chances of commercial greatness that hung upon the future; but where stand they now? At the last census, Charleston had 42,806 inhabitants, having increased in ten years precisely 1,669. Norfolk had 14,320, or 3,400 more than she had in 1840, while New York and Brooklyn had risen to more than 600,000.

We are told, however, that this is all due to the action of the Federal Government; that 'the immense commercial resources of the



South are amongst the most startling and certain resources in all emergencies; that 'if there was no tariff of any kind, and absolute free trade, the southern seaports would in a quarter of a century surpass the northern ones not only in imports and exports, but also in population and the arts,'—and that the way to bring about this reign of free-trade and prosperity is to tax all merchandise imported from northern ports, or in northern ships, while admitting free all those imported from Europe, or in southern vessels. Incredible as it may seem to our readers, such is the mode we find advocated in the *Richmond Enquirer* as the one required for the establishment of perfect free trade.

If, however, the prosperity of New York, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania, which are manufacturing States, has really been due to the tariff, and if protection is injurious to agricultural communities, how, we would ask, can we account for the growth of Indiana and Illinois, which are not manufacturing States? Agreeably to the slavery theory, they should suffer equally with South Carolina and Virginia; and yet we find them growing to almost a million each of population, while Arkansas, almost as old, has less than 200,000. Their railroads count by thousands of miles, while Arkansas has yet, we believe, the first mile of road to make. Southern men can scarcely charge the new State of Wisconsin with protection, and yet she bids fair to have a thousand miles of railroad before Texas shall have completed the first hundred miles of her first road. Telegraphs abound through the West and North-Western States, and Ohio presents a perfect network of them; while Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia present to view little more than a single line, and that maintained almost exclusively by the transmission of intelligence across them from northern cities to New Orleans. Look where we may, we find the same result; throughout the North there is the activity of freedom and life, while throughout the South there is the palsy of slavery and death.

The prosperity of the Northwest is, however, as we are told, also due to the partiality of the Federal Government, the almost exclusive management of which has been so generally in Southern hands. What Massachusetts and this State gain from the tariff is made up to the newer States by donations out of the common treasury of lands. On this head we quote from the *Richmond Whig*:—

"Illinois is indebted for these two thousand miles of railroad to the bounty of the Federal Government, a bounty indulged at the expense of the Southern States, whose feebleness and decay are succeeded at. Every foot of these roads has been made by appropriations of public lands. Not a cent has come out of the pockets of the people. And railroads are not the only favors bestowed upon the hireling States. Immense contributions have been made to them all, for schools and colleges. We dare say, if the same liberal measure had been dealt out to the slaveholding States; if their territory had been permeated by canals and railroads, and schools established in every neighborhood, at the expense of the Northern States, we, too, might boast of our pros-



perity. It would not be going too far to say, that Illinois herself, if, in addition to the millions she has received from the federal treasury, had had the benefit of slave labor, might have been still more prosperous."

In reply to this, a contemporary furnishes the following abstract of a report from the department of the Interior, made a few weeks since, showing the donations of lands to six Western free States and six slave States to which we beg the attention of our readers:—

	O., Ia., Ill., Mich., Iowa, Wisconsin.	Mo., Ala., Mi., La., Ark., Florida.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Acres.</i>
School Lands.....	5,273,743	5,520,501
Universities.....	253,360	207,366
Seats of Government.....	28,560	22,300
Salines.....	261,045	161,230
Internal Improvement.....	1,569,449	2,600,000
Roads.....	251,355	
Canals and Rivers.....	4,996,873	400,000
Railroads.....	2,595,053	5,788,098
Swamp Lands.....	11,265,333	2,153,020
Individuals and Companies.....	60,981	17,839
Military Services.....	20,167,763	5,716,974
	<hr/> 46,723,391	<hr/> 45,167,325

The appropriations here appear to be equal, but when we come to deduct the lands selected by individuals who had their choice to go into Southern or Northern States, we find the Southern grants for public purposes to be forty millions against twenty-five millions of Northern ones. Men do not to any extent go voluntarily into the slave States, but vast numbers leave those States to settle in the free ones, as is shown by the fact that the late census exhibits more than six hundred thousand people from the former settled in the latter, while the latter exhibit but 208,000 persons from the former; and if we deduct from them the number settled in the three States nearest the free ones, Delaware, Maryland and Missouri, which *must* belong to a Northern Union whenever formed, we shall find but 123,000 remaining, or about one to five.

\* \* \* The aristocracy does not work. The democracy does, and hence it is that the six free and six slave States, having received from the treasury, for all purposes, an equal quantity of land, presented to view, at the date of the last census, the following comparison between the railroads completed and in progress:

"The hireling States" of Ohio, Indiana, Illi- nois, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin.		The aristocratic States of Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Florida.	
<i>Completed. In progress.</i>		<i>Completed. In progress.</i>	
2,913*	4,955	417	2,318

\*Illinois has now near 3000 miles of Railroad in operation.

†This pamphlet was published over two years ago.

A similar comparison, now made out, would present results still more striking; but even this should be sufficient to satisfy our readers, first, of the insignificance of the trade offered by the South to the North as the price of union, and second, that the enormous difference existing is not due to any action of the Federal Government, in the management of which the North has so uniformly been denied the slightest control."

#### THE BEARING OF SLAVERY ON THE VALUE OF LAND.

The average value of farming lands in the slave States is about \$8 per acre. In the free States, about \$20 per acre. This leaves a difference in favor of the farming lands in the free States of \$12 per acre. By multiplying this difference by the whole number of acres of farming land in the South, you obtain a product of over two thousands of millions of dollars, which the slave policy takes out of the value of the Southern lands. The slaves have never been estimated at over \$1,500,000 — so that the loss to the South in the mere matter of depreciation of land, is equal to the value of the slaves, and \$500,000,000 besides.

#### BOSTON VERSUS SOUTH CAROLINA.

In 1845 there were 19,039 private families in Boston, and 15,744 of these private families kept no servants, and only 1,069 families kept more than *one*. Yet, in 1854, the real estate property of Boston was \$97,764,500—\$45,271,120 more than the real estate of South Carolina, including Charleston and 24,500 square miles of land. South Carolina owns 384,984, which, at \$400 a head, would bring \$153,993,600. The actual property of Boston, in 1854, was sufficient to buy all these slaves at \$400 dollars a piece, and also, at the market value, all the houses and lands of that proud and boastful State.

#### MANUFACTURES.

The manufactures of the South, in 1839, earned \$42,178,184; those of the north \$197,658,040.

The entire earnings of North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana were \$189,321,719, while those of New York alone were \$193,806,533.

The South had invested in manufactories \$95,918,842, with an annual return of 167,606,380; while the North had invested in manufactories \$431,290,351, with an annual return of \$845,430,428. In 1853 the Southern shipping was worth \$17,331,880, while the Northern shipping was worth \$153,244,880. In 1852, the South had 2,144 miles of railroad; while the North had 9,661 miles of railroad.

#### PROPERTY OF FREE AND SLAVE STATES.

In 1850, the whole property, real and personal, of the slave States amounted to \$2,755,411,554; while that of the free States was



\$3,186,683,924. But the working men are included in this estimate of the Slave States. These 3,200,412 slaves, at \$400 per head, would bring the sum of \$1,280,164,800, which, taken from the above gross sum, leaves \$1,475,246,754, only a little more than one-third of the whole amount of the value of the free States.

#### INVENTIONS.

From 1790 to 1849 there were granted for inventions made in the free States, 16,514 patents, and only 2,202 in the slave States, District of Columbia and foreigners omitted. In 1850, 64 persons in the South and 656 to those in the North.

Many of these Southern patents were granted to men from the free States.

It is believed that the machinery driven by water and steam in New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts earn more than *the three millions of slaves*.

#### SCHOOLS AND ILLITERATE PERSONS.

In the Slave States, in 1839, there were at schools and colleges, 301,170 pupils. In the free States, at the same time, there were 2,212,444. New York sent to school at that time, more than twice as many persons as all the slave States.

In 1839, there were in Connecticut, 163,853 free persons, and of these who could not read and write, there were 526. In South Carolina, at the same time, there were 111,663 free persons over 20, and of these, there were 20,615 who could not read and write.

In Connecticut, these illiterate persons were mostly foreigners. In South Carolina they were mostly native born citizens. This will hold good of most of the illiterate persons North and South. A sixth part of the voters in South Carolina are unable to read their own ballots.

It will be seen by the census of 1850, that in 1849, the South paid for public schools \$2,717,771; the North \$6,834,388. The South had 976,966 scholars at school; the North had 3,106,961 scholars at school.

In 1850, the South had 2,867,569 native white inhabitants over 20 years of age, and of these 532,605 were unable to read—more than 18 per cent. of the whole—while in the North there were 6,649,001 native white inhabitants over 20 years of age, and only 278,575 unable to read—about 4 per cent. There were in 1850, 5,800 newspapers and periodicals in the United States, and of these, 716, including those in Washington City, were printed in the slave States; 2,084 in the free States.

#### A MAJORITY OF DIRECTORS SHOULD KNOW HOW TO READ AND WRITE.

The State Superintendent of Public Schools in Louisiana, having not long since visited all parts of the State, made an elaborate

report to the legislature, in which is found the following statement: "A local, parochial and State supervision of the schools is what is needed. There should be in every parish a Board of Examiners, consisting of three or more, whose duty it should be to examine applicants for the situation of teacher. In some districts the directors are totally incapable of performing this duty, for the very potent reason that they themselves do not know how to read or write. In looking over the warrants of teachers on file in this office, there were found in one parish the ordinary mark of twelve different directors! In two or three of the districts there were two out of three who signed their mark. This is truly a deplorable fact, and one of which unprincipled teachers have not failed to turn to their own advantage. Two out of every three of the directors should be required to know how to read and write."

We are called upon now to submit to the Border Ruffians, that they may introduce a system producing results like these into territory which has been pledged to freedom for more than thirty years.

It was but a few years since that the Governor of Virginia said, in his message, that of 4000 marriages of white Virginians solemnized in one district within ten years, about one-fourth, or 1000, were unable to sign their names to the marriage contracts, but were obliged to make their *mark*.

#### MILITARY POWER.

During our revolutionary struggle, the population of the Slave States was 1,307,549; they had 657,527 slaves.

New England had at that time 673,215 free persons and 3,886 slaves.

During this period of nine years, the Slave States furnished the continental army with 58,421 regular soldiers, while New England alone furnished 118,380 regulars.

After the battle of Bunker Hill, when there was a call upon the States for soldiers by Congress, South Carolina, on *bended knee*, begged that hers might stay at home to take care of the Negroes, ("*the contented and happy Negroes.*")

March 29, 1779, a committee of Congress reported that "the State of South Carolina is unable to make any effectual effort with militia, by reason of the great proportion of the citizens necessary to remain at home to prevent insurrection among the Negroes and prevent the desertion of them to the enemy."

From 1775 to 1783, South Carolina had 166,018 free inhabitants, while Connecticut had only 158,760. During the nine years' war with the mother country, South Carolina raised 5,508 soldiers—Connecticut 39,831.

While the six Slave States could raise only 58,421 soldiers and 12,779 militia men, Massachusetts alone contributed 67,937 to the



continental army and 15,155 militia men—being 12,000 more than all the Slave States.

One word of remark suggested by these statistics. We meddle not politically with slavery in the States; but shall we extend over territory under our (the people's) control, an institution producing such political results. Leaving out of mind its enormous sin, shall we impoverish and disgrace the nation, by extending slavery, simply to pacify the demands of 300,000 petty despots?—*Statistical Specimens of Free and Slave States, by I. C.*

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### *Southern ideas of Slavery and Liberty, Labor and Laborers.*

#### WHAT THEY THINK OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

"I endorse, without reserve, the much abused sentiment of Governor McDuffie, that slavery is the corner-stone of our republican edifice; while I repudiate as ridiculously absurd, that much-lauded but nowhere accredited dogma of Mr. Jefferson, that 'all men are created equal.'"—*Gov. Hammond, of S. C.*

#### RICH MEN AND SLAVEHOLDERS OUR SOLE DEPENDENCE.

"Though intelligence and wealth have great influence, here as every where, in keeping in check reckless and unenlightened numbers, yet it is evident to close observers that these are rapidly usurping all power in the non-slaveholding States, and threaten a fearful crisis in republican institutions there, at no remote period. In the slave-holding States, however, nearly one-half of the whole population, and those the poorest and most ignorant, have no political influence whatever, because they are slaves of the other half, a large proportion of whom are both educated and independent in their circumstances, while those who, unfortunately, are not so, being still elevated far above the mass, are higher toned and more deeply interested in preserving a stable and well ordered government than the same class in any other country. Hence, slavery is truly 'the corner-stone' and foundation of every well designed and durable republican edifice."—*Id.*

#### SLAVERY THE LAW OF NATURE.

"Man is born to subjection. Not only during infancy is he dependent and under the control of others, but *at all ages*; it is *the very law of his nature* that the strong and the wise should CONTROL the weak and the ignorant."—*Chancellor Harper, of S. C.*

#### LAW MAKES MEN PROPERTY.

"'Man cannot have property in man,'—a phrase as full of meaning as 'who slays fat oxen should himself be fat.' *Certainly he may*, if the laws of society allow it, and, if it be on sufficient grounds, neither he nor society do wrong."—*Id.*

one form of this universal condition, (slavery the universal condition of laborers,) or finally, whether any other, under all the circumstances of the case, is more defensible or stands on stronger grounds of necessity."

### OUR OWN RACE SAVED THE DEGRADATION OF MANUAL LABOR.

The following is an extract from a letter to the *N. Y. Tribune*, by one of the educated and rich gentry of the South, published recently :

"Slavery is indispensable in any country where there is wealth, *and as long as there is a colored race it is better to keep them slaves (even though white blood is intermixed) than to starve the whole of the working white people into slavery, as is done in Europe AND IN OUR NORTHERN STATES.* Some class must do the *dirty work*, and it is fortunate that there is a class, of an inferior race, of dark color, adapted to the occupation. In this way *our own race* is saved the degradation of *manual labor* in the Southern States."

### "EVERY NORTHERN MAN OFFERS HIMSELF FOR SALE."

"They threaten us with a great Northern party and a general war upon the South. If they were not mere hucksters in politics—with only this peculiarity, that every man offers himself instead of some other commodity for sale, we should surmise they might do what they threaten, and thus bring out the *real triumph of the South* by making a dissolution of the Union necessary.

But they will do no such thing. They will bluster, and utter a world of self-glorification, and end by knocking themselves down to the lowest bidder. To be sure, if they could make the best bargain by destroying the South, they would set about it without delay. But they cannot. They live upon us, and the South affords them the double glorification of an object for hatred and a field for plunder. How far they may be moved to carry their indignation this time it is impossible to say; but we may be sure they will cool off just at the point that they discover they can make nothing more out of it, and *may loose.*"

### COULD ANY THING BE COOLER?

"Virginia in this confederacy is the impersonation of the well-born, well-educated, well-bred aristocrat. She looks down from her elevated pedestal, upon her *parvenu*, ignorant, mendacious Yankee villifiers, as coldly and calmly as a marble statue. Occasionally, in Congress, or in the nominating conventions of the Democratic party, she condescends, when her interests demand it, to recognize the existence of her adversaries at the very moment she crushes them, but she does it without anger, and with no more hatred of them than a gardener feels toward the insect, which he finds necessary, occasionally, to destroy."—*Richmond Examiner.*



## CHAPTER VII.

*The issue presented and demand made by the Slave Oligarchy.*

Thus speaks the *Charleston Evening News*.

"It is vain to disguise it; the great issue of our day in this country is *slavery or no slavery*. The present phase of that issue is, the extension or non-extension of the institution the foundations of which are broad and solid in our midst. Whatever the government measure—whatever the political combination—whatever the party movement—whatever the action of sections at Washington, the *one, single, dominant, pervading idea*, solving all leading questions, insinuating itself into every polity—drawing the horoscopes of all aspirants, serving as a lever or fulcrum for every interest, class and individuality—a sort of directing fatality, is that *master issue*. As, in despite of right and reason, organism and men, of interest and efforts, it has become *per se* political destiny, why not meet it? It controls the North; it controls the South; it precludes escape. It is at last and simply between the South and the remainder of the Union, *as sections and as people*.

The following is an extract from a letter to the *N. York Tribune*, from one of the educated and rich gentry of the South:

"We Southerners intend to make *slavery national, not sectional*, so as to be an instrument of progress to the entire South, and the North also, if the North will consent. At any rate, we intend to make *slavery national, even at the cost of forming a Southern nation—an independent slave nation of our own*. The South will then be unfettered, and can go on its own way to prosperity. I agree with Mr. Calhoun, that the North and South cannot compromise this question. *All compromise must be abolished, and slavery made national, or else we must have our own nation.*"

## SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY REPUDIATED.

The *Richmond (Va.) Enquirer* thus expresses itself:

"We must, in the Cincinnati platform, *repudiate Squatter Sovereignty, and expressly assert State equality*. We must declare that it is the duty of the general government to see that no invidious or injurious distinctions are made between the people *or the property of different sections in the territories*. We do not mean to dictate. It may be that the assertion in the platform of the abstract proposition of State equality may suffice to carry along with it the consequences which we desire. But it is often charged that the Kansas-Nebraska bill contains the doctrine of *Squatter Sovereignty, and Squatter Sovereignty is the most efficient agent of Free-Soil-ism*. Some [all] *Northern Democrats have maintained this ground*. Now, THIS GUN MUST BE SPIKED. It must appear from our platform that we maintain *practical State equality, and repudiate that construction of the Kansas-Nebraska act which would defeat it*. The South only demands equality of right. The more clearly it appears that the Northern Democracy is ready to concede it to her the more certain is our candidate of success."

POWER OF CONGRESS OVER U. S. TERRITORY MAINTAINED BY THE  
RICHMOND (VA.) ENQUIRER.

"The sovereignty of the people is a noble principle, and should command universal homage. 'Squatter Sovereignty' is an imposture—a counterfeit copy—an ugly idol wrought by men's hands—and should be kicked off the pedestal where it sits in mock majesty, and courts the adoration of fools and demagogues.

"We cannot conceive *how any doubt can arise as to the full, perfect, unlimited and sovereign power of the federal government over the territory of Kansas, as the agent or trustee of the existing States*. By the purchase from Louisiana and the subsequent extinction of the Indian titles, the territory became ours, to *dispose of and govern as we pleased, for the common benefit of all the States*. The States can only exercise their sovereign administrative and governmental rights *through the instrumentality of the federal government*."

ABSOLUTE DOMINION OVER U. S. TERRITORY BY THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT ESSENTIAL TO OUR EXISTENCE AS A NATION, BY THE RICHMOND (VA.) ENQUIRER.

“This absolute dominion over our territories is essential to our existence as a nation. It might happen that a new conquered territory, or a territory occupied by free Negroes, Indians, Chinese, hordes of robbers, or lawless, ignorant, and immoral people of any kind, could not be trusted with any voice in their own government even as a territory, *much less would such people be entitled to admission as a State, simply because they had population sufficient to elect a member to Congress.* The federal government is bound to govern all the territories. It may and should exercise its powers through a territorial government elected by the people, to be governed when the people are sufficiently moral and intelligent for self-government, *and are well affected to us and our institutions.* It should admit no people as a State who are not in all respects fitted for self-government, *and should look closely to the provisions of the Constitution of the people so applying, to see whether the great interests of morality, religion, property and liberty are adequately secured.* To give practical application to our doctrine: *If it should hereafter appear that a majority of new-comers in Kansas confiscate or render valueless the property of the first settlers, and, in effect, banish those settlers from the State, by their Constitution, then it is clear with such Constitution she should not be admitted into the Union.* First, because her people betray a want of justice and morality in their very Constitution. And, secondly, because the federal government, the common agent of every section of the Union, is bound, within the limits of its powers, to do equal justice to all. We do not mean to contend, that when the slave-holding interest in a territory is small, and its Constitution gives ample time and opportunity for the removal of slaves, that she should not be admitted as a State. But we do contend that, if the Constitution of any territory, asking admission into the Union, contains any gross violations of morality, religion, property or liberty, Congress should not hesitate to refuse her petition.”

#### TERRITORIAL LEGISLATION NO POWER TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY FROM U. S. TERRITORY.

“Federal government is empowered and obliged to see that the citizens of the States have equal rights in the territories, and to secure them in the quiet enjoyment of their property. *For illustration: if any operative local law should exclude slavery from Kansas, the federal government is bound to remove the restriction. If a territorial legislature were to attempt to abolish slavery within the limits of any territory, it would be the imperative duty of the federal government to interfere and protect the securities of property.* These are political postulates, self-evident propositions in the theory of our government.”—*Richmond (Va.) Inquirer.*

#### THE MARK HIT.

“The ensuing Presidential canvass, which will probably determine the fate of the Union, will turn almost *solely on the question of equality.* NONE CAN CONSISTENTLY OR EFFECTIVELY CONTEND FOR STATE EQUALITY, who do not hold



that the institutions of the South are equally *rightful, legitimate, moral and promotive of human happiness and well-being with those of the North*. If slave society be inferior in these respects to free society, we of the South are wrong and criminal in proposing to extend it to new territory, and the North right in exerting itself to the utmost to prevent such extension."—*Charleston Mercury*.

### THE ISSUE CONCEDED—THE DEMAND ACKNOWLEDGED BY THE SLAVE DEMOCRACY.

1. By the construction voted upon the Kansas-Nebraska bill at the time of its passage by the *slave Democracy*.

The fourteenth section declares that the laws of the United States shall be in force in the territory, with the exception of the Missouri act :

"Which, being inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery, in the States and territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the 'Compromise measures,' is hereby declared inoperative and void ; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any territory or state, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

Pertinent to this point is the following extract from Coddington's speech against Douglas, given in Joliet in the summer of 1854, page 12 :

Now it is admitted on all hands that this clause abrogates the Missouri restriction, and that there are slaves now held in that territory. Had it not been for this bill there could be no legal slaves there. Therefore it has practically and really legislated slavery into this territory. To be sure, the slavery there now is unconstitutional, but the judges appointed, or to be appointed there, will be pro-slavery and five out of nine on the supreme bench are slave-holders. But what is the meaning of the phrase, "but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," &c. ?

Douglas and his friends in the North would convey the impression that the legislature has power to prohibit the existence of slavery, but slavery being a matter entirely exceptional to ordinary legislation, it may fairly be inferred that the phrase "domestic institutions" does not cover legislation on the matter of slavery. And this is the understanding of the matter at the South, and will be at the North, when they consider the following amendment which was designed to test the meaning of the party, in the phrase, "*to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way*." Mr. Chase, in order to test this matter, offered the following amendment : "*Under which the people of the territory, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of slavery therein*." This is the very doctrine that Mr. Douglas has held here to-day, and that the Nebraska democrats are holding all over the North, to reconcile the



people to this bill. But how did Mr. Douglas and his friends in the South receive it? It perplexed and disconcerted them, and they voted it down. Why? Because the South would not go for it with that construction. *And by voting it down they voted the Southern construction upon the phrase, "to leave, &c."*

Mr. Brown, of Miss., who voted for the bill as it stands, gives the Southern view of the bill as follows: "I have not in my judgment, and I trust I have not in my action here, yielded the principle that the people of the territory during their territorial existence, *have the right to exclude slavery.* I have not intended to yield that point, and I do not mean that my action in future times shall be so construed." The same gentleman in his fourth of March speech, in 1850, says: "It is assumed that the people of a territory have the same inherent right of self-government as the people in the States. The assumption is utterly unfounded, unconstitutional, without example, and contrary to the entire practice of the government, from its commencement to the present time, as I shall proceed to show."

Said Mr. Prescott, following on the same side and speaking of the people of a territory. "Until they form or organize their sovereign State government, their rights of sovereignty are dormant and in abeyance. Yes, sir, this thing you create and call a territorial government, is a mere temporary, fugacious, local police institution—a limited, dependent, municipal corporation, similar to those existing in counties, cities, parishes, towns and boroughs, incorporated by our State legislature. The institution of slavery is a *political* institution; it is not a mere *municipal* regulation."

The South Side *Democrat*, speaking of Mr. Chase's amendment, a very able paper published at Petersburg, Virginia, says: "This proposition comes to us in a very plausible garb, but it is plausible only, and is at war with the doctrine of non-intervention upon which the bill before Congress rests. It is a ridiculous vagary of "squatter sovereignty," recognized in its most intense essence." Thus Mr. Chase's amendment was voted down and the Southern construction of this doubtful passage was acceded to; and then these men come North and tell us that they meant just what Mr. Chase's amendment declared, all the time. Thus these tools of the South ever keep "the promise to the Northern ear, and always break it to the hope."

2. By the assertion of Mr. Douglas in his recent report on Kansas affairs, as Chairman of Committee on Territories, *that all power possessed by the inhabitants of a U. S. territory, must be derived "through the ACT of Congress" from the Constitution*, and the doctrine asserted in the same report, and everywhere else by the Democracy, so called, that Congress has *no power* over the subject of slavery whatever.

The following is from his report on Kansas affairs:

"They (the territories) are entitled to enjoy and exercise all privileges and rights of self-government in subordination to the Constitution of the United States, and in obedience to the organic law passed by Congress in pursuance of that instrument. *These rights and privileges are all derived from the Constitution, through the act of Congress, and must be exercised and enjoyed in subjection to all the limitations and restrictions which that Constitution imposes.*"

We add in this place the first resolution of the so-called National Democratic party of Illinois, adopted at its recent Convention at Springfield:

1. *Resolved*, That the Constitution of the United States is a political contract between the people of independent sovereignties which bestows paramount authority to the extent of the powers delegated, but leaves those not delegated, to the States respectively, or to the people; that a vigilant guard against the centralization of the reserved powers is essential to the preservation of our institutions; *and that Congress has no rightful authority to establish, abolish, or prohibit slavery in the States or Territories.*

Thus the reader will see that, according to the *new faith* of the so-called Democracy, the following positions are assumed:

1. Congress possesses all *law-making* over the territories of the United States.

2. But "Congress has no rightful authority to establish, abolish or prohibit slavery in the territories."

3. But "all" "rights and privileges" of the people of a territory "are derived from the Constitution," "through the *act of Congress.*"

4. Therefore the laws of Kansas, establishing slavery there, are null and void.

5. Hence the support of slavery in Kansas, by the so-called National Democracy, must be on the ground of the Calhoun doctrine, now the *doctrine of the whole South*, viz: that the Constitution in its own virtue covers and protects slave property equally with every other kind of property.

\*This Calhoun doctrine, once repudiated by the whole South, as contrary to the views of Jefferson, and the very abhorrence of Jackson, the modern so-called Democracy, at the demand of that very South, have received and now swear by.

Let this doctrine become permanent, and Toombs can "call the roll" of his slaves "*under the shadow of Bunker Hill's shaft,*" and others, as they have threatened, "*will flog their slaves in the corn-fields of Ohio and of Illinois.*"

---

\* "That the Constitution of the United States carries slavery with it wherever the American banner is unfurled." "That whenever any new district of country comes under the Constitution, slavery is established within it until it is abolished by the after-formed State."—*J. C. Calhoun.*



## CHAPTER VIII.

*Bearing of Slavery on Non-Slave-holders of the South.*

We copy the following extracts from Mr. Weston's communication to the *N. Y. Tribune*, on

## THE POOR WHITES OF THE SOUTH.

"Be the sin, the dangers and evils of slavery all our own. We compel, we ask, none to share them with us."—*Letters of Gov. Hammond, of S. C., to Thomas Clarkson.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *N. Y. TRIBUNE*:

Sir—The number of slave-holders in the slave States of this Union, as ascertained by the census returns of 1850, was 347,525. An average of five persons and seven-tenths to a family, as assumed by the superintendent of the census, would give 1,980,894 as the number of persons interested as slave-holders, in their own right, or by family relation. The whole number of whites in the slave-holding States being 6,222,418, the slave-holding proportion is a fraction short of thirty-two per cent.

The superintendent of the census, Professor De Bow, says of the number, 347,525, returned as slave-holders:

"The number includes slave hirers, but is exclusive of those who are interested conjointly with others in slave property. The two will about balance each other, for the whole South, and leave the slave owners as stated.

"Where the party owns slaves in different counties, or in different States, he will be entered more than once. This will disturb the calculation very little, being only the case among the larger properties."

The addition of those who are "slave hirers" merely, to the category of slave owners, must, I think, swell their number much more than it is diminished by the exclusion of "those who are interested conjointly with others in slave property." Such instances of conjoint interest will occur most frequently in the family relations, already taken into account, when we multiplied the number of slave-holders returned by five and seven-tenths. A comparison of the returns from Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia, where slave-hiring is much practiced, with Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, where it is less practiced, shows the following results:

Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia, with 566,583 slaves, returns 72,584 slave-owners. Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, with 897,531 slaves, return 73,081 slave-owners. The relative excess of slave-owners returned in Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia, must be attributed, in part, to the inclusion of a relatively larger number of "slave-hirers." Upon the whole, it may be safely concluded that at least seven-tenths of the whites in the Slave States, are not slave-owners, either in their own right, or by family relation. The number of white males in the Slave States, aged twenty-one years and upward, in 1850, was 1,490,892.

Considering that the number of 347,525, returned as slave-owners, is subject to some deductions, and considering that of the slave-owners many are females and minors, it is probable that not exceeding one-fifth of the white male adults of the Slave States own slaves.

## DEGRADED BUT GROWING WORSE.

From a paper on "Domestic Manufactures in the South and West," published by M. Tarver, of Missouri, in 1847, I make the following extracts:

"The free population of the South may be divided into two classes—the slave-holder and the non-slave-holder. I am not aware that the relative numbers of



these two classes have ever been ascertained in any of the States; but I am satisfied that the non-slave-holders far outnumber the slave-holders—perhaps by three to one. In the more Southern portion of this region, the non-slave-holders possess, generally, but very small means, and the land which they possess is almost universally poor, and so sterile that a scanty subsistence is all that can be derived from its cultivation; and the more fertile soil, being in the possession of the slave-holder, must ever remain out of the power of those who have none.

“This state of things is a great drawback, and bears heavily upon and depresses the moral energies of the poorer classes. \* \* The acquisition of a respectable position in the scale of wealth appears so difficult that they decline the hopeless pursuit, and many of them settle down into habits of idleness and become the almost passive subjects of all its consequences. And I lament to say that I have observed of late years that an evident deterioration is taking place in this part of the population, the younger portion of it being less educated, less industrious, and in every point of view less respectable than their ancestors. \* \* It is, in an eminent degree, the interest of the slave-holder that a way to wealth and respectability should be opened to this part of the population, and that encouragement should be given to enterprise and industry; and what would be more likely to afford this encouragement than the introduction of manufactures? \* \* To the slave-holding class of the population of the South-west, the introduction of manufactures is not less interesting than to the non-slave-holding class. The former possess almost all the wealth of the country. The preservation of this wealth is a subject of the highest consideration to those who possess it.”

### WE HAVE TO FEAR THE UPHEAVING OF OUR MASSES.

In the January number, of 1850, of *De Bow's Review*, is an article on “Manufactures in South Carolina,” by J. H. Taylor, of Charleston, S. C., from which I make the following extracts:

“There is in some quarters a natural jealousy of the slightest innovation upon established habits; and because an effort has been made to collect the poor and unemployed white population into our new factories, fears have arisen that some evil would grow out of the introduction of such establishments among us.

“Let us, however, look at this matter with candor and calmness, and examine all its bearings before we determine that the introduction of a profitable industry will endanger our institutions. \* \* The poor man has a vote as well as the rich man, and in our State the number of the former will largely over-balance the latter. So long as these poor but industrious people could see no mode of living except by a degrading operation of work with the Negro upon the plantation, they were content to endure life in its most discouraging forms, satisfied they were *above* the slave, though faring often worse than he. But the progress of the world is ‘onward,’ and though in some sections it is slow, still it is ‘onward’ and the great mass of our poor white population begin to understand that they have rights, and that they, too, are entitled to some of the sympathy which falls upon the suffering. They are fast learning that there is an almost infinite world of industry opening before them by which they can elevate themselves and their families from wretchedness and ignorance to competence and intelligence. *It is this great upheaving of our masses that we have to fear, so far as our institutions are concerned.*” \* \* \*

### HOW THEY OBTAIN “A PRECARIOUS SUBSISTENCE.”

Gov. Hammond, in an address before the South Carolina Institute, in 1850, describes these poor whites as follows:

“They obtain a precarious subsistence by occasional jobs, by hunting, by fishing, by plundering fields or folds, and too often by what is in its effects far worse—trading with slaves, and seducing them to plunder for their benefit.”

## GLAD TO WORK FOR HALF PRICE.

Elsewhere Mr. Gregg speaks as follows :

"It is only necessary to build a manufacturing village of shanties, in a healthy location, in any part of the State, to have crowds of these people around you, seeking employment at half the compensation given to operatives at the North. It is, indeed, painful to be brought in contact with such ignorance and degradation."

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND PERSONS DON'T WORK—"SCHOOL FUND"—"WASTE OF MONEY"—"ONLY A STEP IN ADVANCE OF THE INDIAN OF THE FOREST,"—"CHRISTIANIZING OUR POOR WHITES."

From an address upon the subject of manufactures in South Carolina, delivered in 1851, before the South Carolina Institute, by Wm. Gregg, Esq., I make the following extracts :

"In all other countries, and particularly manufacturing States, labor and capital are assuming an antagonistical position. Here it cannot be the case; capital will be able to control labor, even in manufactures with whites, for blacks can be resorted to in case of need. \* \* \* From the best estimates that I have been able to make, I put down the white people who ought to work and who do not, or who are so employed as to be wholly unproductive to the State, at one hundred and twenty-five thousand. \* \* \* By this it appears that but one-fifth of the present poor whites of our State would be necessary to operate 1,000,000 spindles. \* \* \* The appropriation annually made by our Legislature for our School Fund, every one must be aware, so far as the country is concerned, has been little better than a waste of money. \* \* \* While we are aware that the Northern and Eastern States find no difficulty in educating their poor, we are ready to despair of success in the matter, for even penal laws against the neglect of education would fail to bring many of our country people to send their children to school. \* \* \* I have long been under the impression, and every day's experience has strengthened my convictions, that the evils exist in the wholly neglected condition of this class of persons. Any man who is an observer of things could hardly pass through our country without being struck by the fact that all the capital, enterprise and intelligence is employed in directing slave labor; and the consequence is, that a large portion of our poor white people are wholly neglected, and are suffered to while away an existence in a state but one step in advance of the Indian of the forest. It is an evil of vast magnitude, and nothing but a change in public sentiment will effect its cure. These people must be brought into daily contact with the rich and the intelligent—they must be stimulated to mental action, and taught to appreciate education and the comforts of civilized life; and this, we believe, may be effected only by the introduction of manufactures. \* \* \* My experience at Graniteville has satisfied me, that unless our poor people can be brought together in villages, and some means of employment afforded them, it will be an utterly hopeless effort to undertake to educate them. \* \* \* We have collected at that place about 800 people, and as likely looking a set of country girls as can be found, industrious and orderly people, but deplorably ignorant, three-fourths of the adults not being able to read, or to write their names. \* \* \* With the aid of ministers of the Gospel on the spot to preach to them and lecture them on the subject, we have obtained but about sixty children for our school, of about a hundred that are in the place. We are satisfied that nothing but time and patience will enable us to bring them all out. \* \* \* It is very clear to me, that the only means of educating and Christianizing our poor whites, will be to bring them into such villages, where they will not only become intelligent, but a thrifty and useful class in our community. \* \* \* Notwithstanding our rule that no one can be permitted to occupy our houses who does not send all his children to school that are between the ages of 6 and 12, it was with some difficulty, at first, that we could make up even a small school."



## "OUR HALF-FED, HALF-CLOTHED" NON-SLAVE-HOLDING WHITES.

In a paper published in 1852 upon the "*Industrial regeneration of the South*," advocating manufactures, the Hon. J. H. Lumpkin, of Georgia, says:

"It is objected that these manufacturing establishments will become the hot-beds of crime. \* \* But I am by no means ready to concede that our poor, degraded, half-fed, half-clothed, and ignorant population—without Sabbath-schools, or any other kind of instruction, mental or moral, or without any just appreciation of character—will be injured by giving them employment, which will bring them under the oversight of employers, who will inspire them with self-respect by taking an interest in their welfare."

## THE POOR WHITE MAN WILL ENDURE PINCHING POVERTY RATHER THAN TO WORK BESIDE THE NEGRO.

A paper upon *Cotton and Cotton Manufactures at the South*, by Mr. Charles T. James (United States Senator) of Rhode Island, which I find in De Bow's *Industrial Resources of the South and West*, contains statements similar, in substance, to those of Messrs. Taylor, Gregg, and Lumpkin. Mr. James' pursuits have made him acquainted with the condition of manufactures in all sections of the country, and his essays are written in a spirit of candor, and even kindness, to the South, as their publication by De Bow sufficiently proves. Mr. James says:

"This is a subject on which, though it demands attention, we should speak with delicacy. It is not to be disguised, nor can it be successfully controverted, that a degree and extent of poverty and destitution exist in the Southern States, among a certain class of people, almost unknown in the manufacturing districts of the North. The poor white man will endure the evils of pinching poverty, rather than engage in servile labor under the existing state of things, even were employment offered him, which is not general. The white female is not wanted at service, and, if she were, she would, however humble in the scale of society, consider such service a degree of degradation to which she could not condescend; and she has, therefore, no resource, but to suffer the pangs of want and wretchedness. Boys and girls, by thousands, destitute both of employment and the means of education, grow up to ignorance and poverty, and, too many of them, to vice and crime. \* \* The writer knows, from personal acquaintance and observation, that poor Southern persons, male and female, are glad to avail themselves of individual efforts to procure a comfortable livelihood in any employment deemed respectable for white persons. They make applications to cotton mills where such persons are wanted, in numbers much beyond the demand for labor; and, when admitted there, they soon assume the industrious habits and decency in dress and manners of the operators in Northern factories. A demand for labor in such establishments is all that is necessary to raise this class from want and beggary, and (too frequently) moral degradation, to a state of comfort, comparative independence, and moral and social respectability. Beside this, thousands of such would naturally come together as residents in manufacturing villages, where, with very little trouble and expense, they might receive a common school education, instead of growing up in profound ignorance."

## "ONE MASTER GRASPS THE WHOLE DOMAIN."

First the farmer without slaves, and then the small planter, succumbs to the conquering desolation. How feelingly it is depicted in the following extract from an Address delivered a few weeks since by the Hon. C. C. Clay, jr., of Alabama:

"I can show you, with sorrow, in the older portions of Alabama, and in my native county of Madison, the sad memorials of the artless and exhausting culture of cotton. Our small planters, after taking the cream off their lands, unable to restore them by rest, manures, or otherwise, are going further West and South, in search of other virgin lands, which they may and will despoil and impoverish in like manner. Our wealthier planters, with greater means and no more skill, are buying out their poorer neighbors, extending their plantations, and adding to their slave force. The wealthy few, who are able to live on smaller profits and to give their blasted fields some rest, are thus pushing off the many who are merely inde-



pendent. Of the \$20,000,000 annually realized from the sales of the cotton crop of Alabama, nearly all not expended in supporting the producers is re-invested in land and negroes. Thus the white population has decreased and the slave increased almost *pari passu* in several counties in our State. In 1825 Madison County cast about 3,000 votes; now she cannot cast exceeding 2,300. In traversing that county, one will discover numerous farm-houses, once the abode of industrious and intelligent freemen, now occupied by slaves, or tenantless, deserted and dilapidated: he will observe fields, once fertile now unfenced, abandoned and covered with those evil harbingers, fox-tail and broomsedge; he will see the moss growing on the mouldering walls of once thrift villages, and will find 'one only master grasps the whole domain' that once furnished happy homes for a dozen white families. Indeed, a country in its infancy, where fifty years ago scarce a forest tree had been felled by the axe of the pioneer, is already exhibiting the painful signs of senility and decay, apparent in Virginia and the Carolinas."

Now will our *Northern* men, who never expect to be slave-holders, vote to extend slavery over Kansas, when it works such desolation and woe to non-slave-holders, as the *above* confessions of *slave-holders* proclaim?

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### *Kansas.*

Was Kansas invaded and her elections carried by ruffians residing outside of its limits? The following extract from the speech recently delivered in the U. S. Senate by Wm. H. Seward, is a sufficient answer:

The Free State party, through Gen. Pomroy, say: "The ballot-box that was opened upon virgin soil was closed to us by overpowering numbers and impending force. So bold and reckless were our invaders that they cared not to conceal their attack. They came upon us, not in the guise of voters, to steal away our franchise, but boldly and openly to snatch it with a strong hand. They came directly from their own homes, and in compact and organized bands, with arms in hand and provisions for the expedition, marched to our polls, and when their work was done, returned whence they came. It is unnecessary to enter into the details; it is enough to say that in three districts, in which, by the most irrefragible evidence, there was not one hundred and fifty voters, most of whom refused to participate in the mockery of the elective franchise, these invaders polled over a thousand votes."

In regard to the election of the 30th of March, 1855, the same party state:

"They (the Missourians) arrived at their several destinations the night before the election, and having pitched their camps and placed

their sentries, waited for the coming day. Baggage wagons were there, with arms and ammunition enough for a protracted fight, and among them two brass field pieces, ready charged. They came with drums beating and flags flying, and their leaders were of the most prominent and conspicuous men of their respective States. In the morning they surrounded the polls, armed with guns, bowie knives and revolvers, and declared their determination to vote at all hazards and in spite of all consequences. If the judges could be made to subserve their purposes and receive their votes, and if no obstacle was cast in their way, their leaders exerted themselves to preserve peace and order in the conduct of the election; but at the same time did not hesitate to declare, that if not allowed to vote, they would proceed to any extremity in destruction of property and life. If the control of the polls could not be had otherwise, the judges were by intimidation, and, if necessary, by violence, prevented from performing their duty, or, if unyielding in this respect, were driven from their post, and the vacancy filled in form by the persons on the ground; and whenever by any means they had obtained the control of the board, the foreign vote was promiscuously poured in, without discrimination or reserve, or the slightest care to conceal its nefarious illegality. At one of the polls, two of the judges having manfully stood up in the face of the armed mob and declared they would do their duty, one portion of the mob commenced to tear down the house, another proceeded to break in the door of the judges' room, while others, with drawn knives, posted themselves at the window, with the proclaimed purpose of killing any voter who would allow himself to be sworn. Voters were dragged from the window, because they would not show their tickets or vote at the dictation of the mob; and the invaders declared openly, at the polls, that they would cut the throats of the judges if they did not receive their votes without requiring an oath as to their residence. The room was finally forced, and the judges, surrounded by an armed and excited crowd, were offered the alternative of resignation or death, and five minutes were allowed for their decision. The ballot-box was seized, and, amid shouts of 'Hurrah for Missouri,' was carried into the mob. The two menaced Judges then left the ground, together with all the resident citizens, except a few who acted in the outrage, because the result expected from it corresponded to their own views.

"When an excess of the foreign force was found to be had at one poll, detachments were sent to the others. \* \* \* A minister of the Gospel, who refused to accede to the demands of a similar mob of some four hundred armed and organized men, was driven by violence from his post, and the vacancy filled by themselves. \* \* \* Another clergyman, for the expression of his opinion, was assaulted and beaten. \* \* \* The inhabitants of the district, powerless to resist the abundant supply of arms and ammunition, organized



preparation, and overwhelming numbers of foreigners, left the polls without voting. \* \* \* In the Lawrence district one voter was fired at as he was driven from the election ground. \* \* \* Finding they had a greater force than was necessary for that poll, some 200 men were drafted from the number, and sent off under the proper officers to another district, after which they still polled from this camp 700 votes. \* \* \* In the fourth and seventh districts the invaders came together in an armed and organized body, with trains of fifty wagons, besides horsemen, and the night before election, pitched their camps in the vicinity of the polls, and having elected their own judges, in place of those who, from intimidation or otherwise, failed to attend, they voted without any proof of residence. In these two election districts, where the census shows 100 votes, there were polled 314 votes, and last fall 765 votes, although a large number of actual residents did not vote on either occasion. \* \* \* From a careful examination of the returns, we are satisfied that over 3000 votes were thus cast by the citizens and residents of the States."

#### THE STATEMENTS OF THE BORDER RUFFIAN PARTY.

I place in opposition to those statements of the party that was overborne, the statements of the party that prevailed, beginning with signals of the attack and ending with celebrations of the victory.

Gen. Stringfellow addressed the invaders in Missouri, on the eve of the election of March 30, 1855, thus:

"To those who have qualms of conscience as to violating laws, State or National, the time has come when such impositions must be disregarded, as your rights and property are in danger; and I advise you, one and all, to enter every election district in Kansas, in defiance of Reeder and his vile myrmidons, and vote at the point of the bowie knife and revolver. Neither give nor take quarter, as our case demands it. It is enough that the slave-holding interest wills it, from which there is no appeal. What right has Gov. Reeder to rule Missourians in Kansas? His proclamation and prescribed oath must be repudiated. It is your interest to do so. Mind that slavery is established where it is not prohibited."

The *Kansas Herald*, an organ of both the administration and the pro-slavery party, announced the result of the legislative election in the territory immediately afterward as follows:

"Yesterday was a proud and glorious day for the friends of Southern Rights. The triumph of the pro-slavery party was complete and overwhelming. Come on, Southern men! bring your slaves and fill up the territory! Kansas is saved."

The *Squatter Sovereign*, published in Missouri, thus announced the result of the election, the day after it closed:



INDEPENDENCE, March 31, 1855.

"Several hundred emigrants from Kansas have just entered our city. They were preceded by the Westport and Independence brass bands. They came in at the west side of the public square, and proceeded entirely around it, the bands cheering us with fine music, and the emigrants with good news. Immediately following the bands were two hundred horsemen in regular order; following these were one hundred and fifty wagons, carriages, &c. They gave repeated cheers for Kansas and Missouri. They report that not an anti-slavery man will be in the Legislature of Kansas. We have made a clean sweep."

A letter written at Brunswick, in Missouri, dated April 20, 1855, and published in the New York *Herald*, a pro-slavery journal, says that

"From five to seven thousand men started from Missouri to attend the election, some to remove, but the most to return to their families, with an intention, if they liked the territory, to make it their permanent abode, at the earliest moment practicable. But they intended to vote. The Missourians were, many of them, Douglas men. There were 150 voters from this county, 175 from Howard, 100 from Cooper. Indeed, every county furnished its quota; and when they set out it looked like an army. \* \* \* They were armed. \* \* \* And, as there were no houses in the territory, they carried tents. Their mission was a peaceable one—to vote, and to drive down stakes for their future homes. After the election, some 1500 of the voters sent a committee to Mr. Reeder, to ascertain if it was his purpose to ratify the election. He answered that it was, and that the majority at an election must carry the day. But it is not to be denied that the 1500, apprehending that the Governor might attempt to play the tyrant—since his conduct had already been insidious and unjust—wore on their hats bunches of hemp. They were resolved, if a tyrant attempted to trample upon the rights of the sovereign people, to hang him."

## CASE SUMMED UP.

On the 29th of May, 1855, *The Squatter Sovereign*, an organ of the invasion, in Missouri, thus gave utterance to its spirit:

"From reports now received of Reeder, he never intends returning to our borders. Should he do so, we, without hesitation, say that our people ought to hang him by the neck, like a traitorous dog as he is, so soon as he puts his unhallowed feet upon our shores.

"Vindicate your characters and the territory; and should the ungrateful dog dare to come among us again, hang him to the first rotten tree.

"A military force to protect the ballot-box! Let President Pierce, or Governor Reeder, or any other power, attempt such a course in this or any other portion of the Union, and that day will never be forgotten."

Gov. Reeder, at Easton, in Pennsylvania, on his first return to that place after the elections, declared the same result in frank and candid words, which cost him his office, namely:

"It was, indeed, too true that Kansas had been invaded, conquered, subjugated, by an armed force from beyond her borders, led on by a fanatical spirit, trampling under foot the principles of the Kansas bill and the right of suffrage."

The Hon. David R. Atchison, a direct and out-spoken man, who never shrinks from responsibility, and who is confessedly eminent at once as a political leader in Missouri and as a leader of the pro-

slavery movement therein directed against Kansas, in a speech reported as having been made to his fellow-citizens, and which, so far as I know, has not been disavowed, said :

“ I saw it with my own eyes. These men came with the avowed purpose of driving or expelling you from the territory. What did I advise you to do ? Why, meet them at their own game. When the first election came off, I told you to go over and vote. You did so, and beat them. We, our party in Kansas, nominated Gen. Whitfield. They, the Abolitionists, nominated Flenniken ; not Flanagan, for Flanagan was a good, honest man, but *Flenniken*. Well, the next day after the election, that same Flenniken, with three hundred of his voters, left the territory, and has never returned—no, never returned !

“ Well, what next ? Why, an election for members of the Legislature, to organize the territory, must be held. What did I advise you to do then ? Why, meet them on their own ground, and beat them at their own game again ; and, cold and inclement as the weather was, I went over with a company of men. My object in going was not to vote ; I had not a right to vote, unless I had disfranchised myself in Missouri. I was not within two miles of a voting place. My object in going was not to vote, but to settle a difficulty between two of our candidates ; and the Abolitionists of the North said, and published it abroad, that Atchison was there, with bowie knife and revolver, and by God 'twas true. I never did go into that territory, I never intend to go into that territory without being prepared for all such kind of cattle. Well, we beat them ; and Gov. Reeder gave certificates to a majority of all the members of both Houses ; and then, after they were organized, as everybody will admit, they were the only competent persons to say who were and who were not members of the same.”

#### BY THEIR FRUITS SHALL YE KNOW THEM.

A tree is known by its fruits. If Missourians voted in Kansas, it would be expected that the ballots deposited would exceed the number of electors. Just so it was. We have seen that it was so asserted. The Executive Journal, recently obtained, proves that in four districts, where the results were not contested, 2,964 votes were cast on the 30th of March, although only 1,365 voters were there, as ascertained by the census. Again : The legislature chosen on the 30th of March, 1855, withdrew from the interior of the territory to a place inconvenient to its citizens, and on the borders of Missouri. There that legislature enacted laws to this effect, namely ; forbidding the speaking, writing, or printing, or publishing, of anything, in any form, calculated to disaffect slaves, or induce them to escape, under pain of not less than five years imprisonment with hard labor ; and forbidding free persons from maintaining, by speech, writing, or printing, or publishing, that slaves cannot lawfully be held in the



territory, under pain of imprisonment and hard labor two years. The legislature further enacted that no person "conscientiously opposed to holding slaves," or entertaining doubts of the legal existence of slavery in Kansas, shall sit as a juror in the trial of any cause founded on a breach of the laws which I have described. They further provided that all officers and attorneys should be sworn not only to support the Constitution of the United States, but also to support and sustain the *organic law of the territory* and the *Fugitive Slave Law*; and that any persons offering to vote shall be *presumed* to be entitled to vote until the contrary is shown; and if any one, when required, shall refuse to take an oath to sustain the fugitive slave Law, he shall not be permitted to vote. Although they passed a law that none but an inhabitant who had paid a tax should vote, yet they made no *time of residence* necessary, and provided for the immediate payment of a poll tax; so virtually declaring that on the eve of an election the people of a neighboring State can come in, in unlimited numbers, and, by taking up a residence of a day or an hour, pay a poll tax, and thus become legal voters, and then, after voting, return to their own State. They thus, in practical effect, provided for the people of Missouri to control future elections at their pleasure, and permitted such only of the real inhabitants of the territory to vote as are friendly to the holding of slaves. They permitted no election of any of the officers in the territory to be made by the people thereof, but created the offices, and filled them, or appointed officers to fill them, for long periods. They provided that the next annual election should be held in October, 1856, and the Assembly should meet in January, 1857; so that none of these laws could be changed until the lower House might be changed, in 1856; but the Council, which is elected for two years, could not be changed so as to allow a change of the laws or officers until the session of 1858, however much the inhabitants of the territory might desire it. How forcibly do these laws illustrate that old political maxim of the English nation, that a Parliament called by a conqueror is itself conquered and enslaved! Who but foreigners, usurpers, and tyrants, could have made for the people of Kansas—a people "perfectly free"—such laws as these? Anatomists will describe the instrument, and even the force of the blow, if only you show them the wound. Behold the proofs on which the allegations of invasion, usurpation, and tyranny, made by the new State of Kansas, rest. They are, first: The President's own virtual admission, by defenses indirect, irrelevant, ill-tempered, sophistical, and evasive. Second: An absolute agreement, concurrence, and harmony, between the statements of the conflicting parties who were engaged in the transactions involved. Third: The consequences of those transactions exactly such as must follow, if the accusations be true, and such as could not result if they be false.



## MORE PROOF.

Mr. Greeley, writing to the New York *Tribune*, in relation to Judge Collamer's speech, wherein fallacious and mis-statements of Senator Douglas were exposed, says :

But Judge Collamer did not rest in inferences, however irresistible. He produced the long expected executive minutes of the territorial government of Kansas, which should have been sent forward in January, but which have been received within the last few days. By the help of these, he was enabled to make this blasting exhibit :

In February of last year, Gov. Reeder, as required by law, had a census of Kansas taken, as a basis for the division of the territory into Council and Representative Districts, and the apportionment of members to each—which apportionment was accordingly made. On the 30th of the following month, the Legislative election was held, and the vote then taken, *in districts not contested before Gov. Reeder*, compares with the officially ascertained number of legal voters in those districts as follows :

Council Dist.	No. Legal Votes.	Votes Polled.
V	442	855
VII	247	586
VIII	208	417
X	468	1,286
Total	1,365	2,964

These official returns, copied from the Executive minutes, prove something more than the existence of astounding frauds—they prove that those frauds were carefully planned and executed under the guidance of a common head. Had the Missourians simply precipitated themselves on the polls of Kansas without pre-concert and common direction, we should inevitably have seen an enormously disproportioned vote polled in one district to that in another—here a few extra votes and there a great many—but no; the work was done according to rule—the rascality was as skilful as audacious.

These districts elected six Councilmen and some twelve of fourteen Representatives—a large majority of the whole number uncontested before Gov. Reeder. One of them was contested, but just one hour too late. From another, the Judge of Election appointed by Gov. Reeder made substantially this official report in writing, which appears on the executive minutes :

“We opened the poll as by law required, but was very soon surrounded by a crowd of strangers from Missouri, who shoved back and intimidated the residents of Kansas, and insisted on voting themselves. We could not take, and dare not refuse their votes; so we abandoned the poll. Whereupon the Missourians proceeded

choose Judges of their own sort, and then voted to their hearts' content, electing their candidates, of course."

This is one of the uncontested districts, and its vote sent two members to the Council, who voted, of course, to expel the honestly chosen Kansas men and fill their places with the border ruffians rejected Gov. Reeder. Isn't this a nice business for Northern men to be holding or cloaking?

#### THE PRESIDENT'S COMPLICITY IN THESE TRANSACTIONS.

A few words, however, must be added, to bring more distinctly in view the President's complicity in these transactions, and to publish his responsibility therefor. The President openly lent his political influence and patronage to the slave-holders of Missouri, to the abrogation of the prohibition of slavery in Kansas. He interfered to prevent, to defeat or to hinder them. He employed his official patronage to aid them. He now defends the usurpation and tyranny, established by the invaders of Kansas, with all the influence of his exalted station, and even the military power of the Republic; and he argues the duty of the people there to submit to the forcible establishment of slavery, violation of the national pledge, which he concurred in giving, they should be left perfectly free to reject and exclude that obnoxious system. It thus appears that the President of the United States holds the people of Kansas prostrate and enslaved at this time."—*Seward's Speech*.

#### HIS INCONSISTENCY, "DORR REBELLION," &c.

The following is from the speech of John P. Hale, recently delivered in the U. S. Senate:

The President of the United States, in his Kansas message, denounces the proceedings of those gentlemen in Kansas who have taken to form a State constitution, as revolutionary, and says that if such measures are carried out it will be treason. Well, sir, perhaps it is very difficult to define and say exactly where people may go to reform their government without the consent of the existing government; and I shall not venture to express any crude notions of my own upon that subject; but I shall favor you with the opinion of the President of the United States himself on that question. It cannot have escaped the recollection of gentlemen about fourteen years ago there was a noted individual in New England by the name of Thomas W. Dorr, who claimed to be Governor of Rhode Island; but the result of his election was that he found he would be safer in any other State than the one he claimed to be Governor. He left there, and went first to Connecticut, and remained there a little while, and then came to New Hampshire. When he arrived in New Hampshire, a large meeting was holden in Concord on the 14th day of Decem-



## MORE PROOF.

Mr. Greeley, writing to the New York *Tribune*, in relation Judge Collamer's speech, wherein fallacious and mis-statements Senator Douglas were exposed, says :

But Judge Collamer did not rest in inferences, however irresistible. He produced the long expected executive minutes of territorial government of Kansas, which should have been sent forward in January, but which have been received within the last days. By the help of these, he was enabled to make this blast exhibit :

In February of last year, Gov. Reeder, as required by law, had a census of Kansas taken, as a basis for the division of the territory into Council and Representative Districts, and the apportionment of members to each—which apportionment was accordingly made. On the 30th of the following month, the Legislative election was held, and the vote then taken, *in districts not contested before Gov. Reeder*, compares with the officially ascertained number of legal voters in those districts as follows :

Council Dist.	No. Legal Votes.	Votes Polled.
V	442	855
VII	247	586
VIII	208	417
X	468	1,286
Total	1,365	2,964

These official returns, copied from the Executive minutes, present something more than the existence of astounding frauds—they present that those frauds were carefully planned and executed under the guidance of a common head. Had the Missourians simply perpetrated themselves on the polls of Kansas without pre-concert and common direction, we should inevitably have seen an enormous disproportioned vote polled in one district to that in another—a few extra votes and there a great many—but no; the work was done according to rule—the rascality was as skilful as audacious.

These districts elected six Councilmen and some twelve of the fifteen Representatives—a large majority of the whole number untested before Gov. Reeder. One of them was contested, but the contest was one hour too late. From another, the Judge of Election appointed by Gov. Reeder made substantially this official report in writing which appears on the executive minutes :

“We opened the poll as by law required, but was very soon surrounded by a crowd of strangers from Missouri, who shoved and intimidated the residents of Kansas, and insisted on voting themselves. We could not take, and dare not refuse their votes, so we abandoned the poll. Whereupon the Missourians proceeded



to choose Judges of their own sort, and then voted to their hearts' content, electing their candidates, of course."

This is one of the uncontested districts, and its vote sent two members to the Council, who voted, of course, to expel the honestly chosen Kansas men and fill their places with the border ruffians rejected by Gov. Reeder. Isn't this a nice business for Northern men to be upholding or cloaking?

#### THE PRESIDENT'S COMPLICITY IN THESE TRANSACTIONS.

"A few words, however, must be added, to bring more distinctly into view the President's complicity in these transactions, and to establish his responsibility therefor. The President openly lent his official influence and patronage to the slave-holders of Missouri, to effect the abrogation of the prohibition of slavery in Kansas. He never interfered to prevent, to defeat or to hinder them. He employed his official patronage to aid them. He now defends the usurpation and tyranny, established by the invaders in Kansas, with all the influence of his exalted station, and even with the military power of the Republic; and he argues the duty of the people there to submit to the forcible establishment of slavery, in violation of the national pledge, which he concurred in giving, that they should be left perfectly free to reject and exclude that justly obnoxious system. It thus appears that the President of the United States holds the people of Kansas prostrate and enslaved at his feet."—*Seward's Speech*.

#### HIS INCONSISTENCY, "DORR REBELLION," &c.

The following is from the speech of John P. Hale, recently delivered in the U. S. Senate:

"The President of the United States, in his Kansas message, denounces the proceedings of those gentlemen in Kansas who have undertaken to form a State constitution, as revolutionary, and says their measures are carried out it will be treason. Well, sir, perhaps it is very difficult to define and say exactly where people may begin to reform their government without the consent of the existing government; and I shall not venture to express any crude opinions of my own upon that subject; but I shall favor you with the opinions of the President of the United States himself on that dry question. It cannot have escaped the recollection of gentlemen that about fourteen years ago there was a noted individual in this country by the name of Thomas W. Dorr, who claimed to be elected Governor of Rhode Island; but the result of his election was that he found he would be safer in any other State than the one which he claimed to be Governor. He left there, and went first to Connecticut, and remained there a little while, and then came to New Hampshire. When he arrived in New Hampshire, a large public meeting was holden in Concord on the 14th day of Decem-

ber, 1842; and at that meeting General Pierce delivered a very congratulatory speech to Governor Dorr, and closed with the presentation of a series of resolutions, which, as they are not long, I will read :

1. *Resolved*, That all government of right originates from the people, is founded in consent, and instituted for the general good.

2. *Resolved*, That whenever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to, reform the old and establish a new form of government.

3. *Resolved*, That if the friends of liberty should wait for leave of tyrants to abolish tyranny, the day of free government would never dawn upon the eyes of the oppressed millions of our race.

4. *Resolved*, That when the people act in their original sovereign capacity in forming and adopting new systems of government, they are not bound to conform to any rules or forms of proceeding not instituted by themselves.

5. *Resolved*, That the adoption of the people's constitution in Rhode Island by thirteen thousand nine hundred and forty-four votes, being an acknowledged and large majority of the whole male adult population of that State, was such an act of the people in their sovereign capacity as rendered it the paramount law of the State.

General Pierce went thus far; but Mr. Hibbard presented the two following additional resolutions, which the New Hampshire *Patriot* says were "cheerfully accepted by Mr. Pierce :"

6. *Resolved*, That in welcoming to the soil of New Hampshire our present distinguished guest, Thomas W. Dorr, the rightful Governor of Rhode Island, we embrace the occasion of tendering the tribute of our respect and esteem to the tried patriotism, and unwavering devotion to the cause of free suffrage which has so eminently and honorably characterized his past career; and that so long as the people of Rhode Island are true to themselves and to the cause of civil liberty, they will never abate their trust nor remit their exertions until their sovereignty shall be acknowledged, the constitution of their adoption established in fact as it now is in right—the paramount law of the land and the officers of their choice restored to the places to which they have been once elected.

7. *Resolved*, That John Tyler, the acting President of the United States in interfering with, and assuming to decide, by the arm of the military power of the general government, the question of sovereignty pending between the people and the charter party of Rhode Island, thereby for a time prostrating the cause of free suffrage and paralyzing the efforts of its friends in that State has been guilty of a flagrant usurpation of unconstitutional power, for which no censure can be too severe, and inflicted an injury upon the cause of constitutional freedom for which no reparation can adequately atone.

Now, to bring the point of these resolutions distinctly before the Senate, I propose to read this last resolution, substituting the name of "Franklin Pierce" for "John Tyler," "Kansas" for "Rhode Island," and "pro-slavery party" for "charter party;" and so how it will then read. It would read in this wise :

*Resolved*, That Franklin Pierce, the acting President of the United States in interfering with, and assuming to decide, by the arm of the military power of the General Government, the question of slavery pending between the people and the pro-slavery party of Kansas, thereby for a time prostrating the cause of free suffrage and paralyzing the efforts of its friends in the



territory, has been guilty of a flagrant usurpation of unconstitutional power, for which no censure can be too severe, and has inflicted an injury on the cause of constitutional freedom, for which no reparation can adequately atone.

He ought certainly to be willing to take such medicine as he administers ; and it seems to me that the cases, with this bare alteration of names, are very nearly parallel—at least enough so for the argument.

#### A PRECEDENT FOR THE FREE STATE CONVENTION OF KANSAS.

In the course of a debate in the Senate the other day, on the proposition to receive the memorial of a number of the free State men of Kansas, asking admission into the Union under the constitution adopted by the Topeka convention, Mr. Douglas characterized the action of that convention as “revolutionary and rebellious,” and declared that he could not recognize Kansas as a State, either in or out of the Union, in consequence of what they had done without authority and law.” His new-born zeal for law is now pretty well understood ; but precedent counts for something in law, and Mr. Waldron, a new representative from Michigan in the House, had shown only two days before, in a brilliant and powerful speech, that the history of that State previous to its admission into the Union furnished a case almost exactly parallel to that of the Free State convention of Kansas. Mr. Waldron is a miller by profession, and his maiden speech is a convincing proof that he knows how to work on the floor of Congress. Mr. Greeley, in a letter to the *New York Tribune*, thus summarises his argument :

In 1835-6, Michigan had out-grown her territorial swaddling-clothes, and was ripe for transformation into a State. But she had an unsettled boundary dispute with Ohio, involving a strip of land on which the city of Toledo has since grown up. There had been serious collisions of jurisdictions, threatening others still more serious ; and Congress resolved not to admit Michigan unless she would consent to quit-claim this disputed territory. On this condition being made known, a new constitutional convention was held, under the auspices of the territorial government, which convention decided *not* to accept admission on the condition imposed by Congress. So the question seemed to be at rest.

But not so : a movement was directly set on foot by voluntary popular agitation, outside of and in defiance of the territorial authorities, for another convention, which was accordingly chosen and held, though none but the friends of the movement recognized it in any way, and two of the most populous counties were not at all represented. This volunteer, spontaneous convention resolved to accept admission on the terms exacted by Congress and rejected by the regular convention ; and sent on the requisite documents to Gen. Jackson, then President. Gen. Jackson sent the proceedings of both conventions to Congress, without indicating any preference on



his own part. They came first before the House, where the following proceedings were had :

*House, Jan. 11, 1836.*—Memorial of the Legislature of the *State of Michigan* presented. Mr. Hannegan, of Ind., moved that it be rejected. Motion defeated; *Franklin Pierce* voting in the majority. Mr. Hannegan then moved that it be received "as the voluntary act of private individuals." This was adopted, but Mr. Pierce voted in the negative. On the question as to which of the two conventions should be recognized as representing the people of Michigan, the Democratic House decided in favor of the irregular or spontaneous convention—Franklin Pierce voting in the majority.

When the question came in due course before the Senate (Democratic) it was referred to its judiciary committee, whereof Felix Grundy, of Tennessee, was chairman. The committee sent out circulars to Michigan, to ascertain which of the rival conventions most truly represented the people of that State, and which had received most of the people's votes. After awaiting and receiving answers to these circulars, the committee reported that the spontaneous convention was entitled to be accredited rather than the regular; and that Michigan should be admitted on its motion. This motion prevailed: yeas, Silas Wright, Benton, Buchanan, Wm. R. King, &c.; nays, only 10. The subject thereupon went to the House, where the action of the Senate was affirmed, and the admission of the State completed: yeas, 148; nays 58; Franklin Pierce and Isaac Toucey among the yeas.

So Michigan came into the Union on the application of a volunteer, anti-regular convention, just like that of free Kansas, and voted for Van Buren for President, in 1836.

Several Southern members emphatically expressed the opinion that this was the strongest speech for free Kansas that had been made at this session.

#### CASS FAVORABLY INCLINED TO THE FREE STATE MEN.

General Cass is favorably inclined to the free State men. He said to Col. Delahay—"I expected that Judge Douglas would touch some, at least, of the questions at issue in his report; but he has not—he merely abused the Emigrant Aid Societies and Reeder. I don't see that they have anything to do with the case." And again—"They talk about your being rebels, and deserving rope and hemp. I would like to see them arrest you; you have done nothing but what we did in Michigan." Of the doctrine underlying Douglas' report, he said—"Berrien (I think) tried that doctrine years ago; it was laughed at; it won't do."

The above is an extract from one of Redpath's letters to the *St. Louis Democrat*.

#### QUALIFICATIONS FOR VOTING IN KANSAS.

But, sir, an attempt is made to get rid of the odium justly attach-

ing to many of the acts of this spurious legislature, not by directly denying the existence of the obnoxious acts, but by introducing into the report the proceedings of a convention of the people of Kansas, composed chiefly of office-holders, as it would seem—the governor, judges, marshal, and district attorney, being present—which undertook to say that the laws of the legislature had been most grossly misrepresented. I wish to look a little at the justification thus set up, and see whether it is warranted by the facts. That convention declares :

“It has been charged, and widely circulated, that the legislature, in order to perpetuate their rule, had passed a law prescribing the qualifications of voters, by which it is declared ‘that any one may vote who will swear allegiance to the Fugitive Slave Law, the Kansas and Nebraska Bill, and pay one dollar;’ such is declared to be the evidence of citizenship, such the qualification of voters. In reply to this, we say that no such law was ever passed by the legislature. The law prescribing the qualification of voters expressly provides that to entitle a person to vote, he must be twenty-one years of age, an actual inhabitant of this territory and of the county or district in which he offers to vote, and shall have paid a territorial tax. *There is no law requiring him to pay a dollar tax as a qualification to vote.*”

We happen to have the laws here, and I wish to call attention to some of their provisions. In chapter 138 of the Kansas Statutes is this provision :

“In addition to the provisions of the act entitled ‘An act for the collection of the revenue,’ the sheriff of each and every county shall, on or before the first Monday of October, 1855, collect the sum of one dollar, as a poll tax, from each person in the said territory of Kansas who may be entitled to vote in said territory, as is provided in the said act to which this is supplementary.”

In chapter 66 of the same book, the qualification of voters is prescribed as follows :

“Every free white male citizen of the United States, and every free male Indian who is made a citizen by treaty or otherwise, and over the age of twenty-one years who shall be an *inhabitant* of this territory, and of the county or district in which he offers to vote, and shall have paid a territorial tax, shall be a qualified voter.”

Section thirteen declares :

“It shall be the duty of the sheriff to have his tax-book at the place of holding elections, and to receive, receipt for, and enter upon his tax book all taxes which may be tendered him on the day of any election.”

Do not these statutes prove the truth of the allegation which the office-holders’ convention has undertaken to deny? Is it not true that any inhabitant may vote who will pay his dollar tax? Is not every voter required to pay the tax? Is not the sheriff required to be present at the polls to receive it? Is any residence necessary? Not a day. It is enough if he who claims the right of suffrage is at the time an “inhabitant” of the territory and district where he offers to vote. We all understand how this word “inhabitant” may be construed so as to require nothing more than inhabitancy at the moment of voting.”—*From Hon. Lyman Trumbull’s speech delivered in the U. S. Senate, March 14, 1856.*



## CHAPTER X.

*Emigrant Aid Societies.*

The following we take from the speech of Hon. Charles Sumner, delivered in the U. S. Senate, 19th May, 1856.

## THE SOCIETY ASSAILED.

It only remains, under this head, that I should speak of the apology *infamous*; founded on false testimony against the Emigrant Aid Company, and assumptions of duty more false than the testimony. Defying truth and mocking decency, this apology excels all others in futility and audacity, while, from its utter hollowness, it proves the utter impotence of the conspirators to defend their crime. Falsehood, always *infamous*, in this case arouses peculiar scorn. An association of sincere benevolence, faithful to the Constitution and laws, whose only fortifications are hotels, school-houses and churches, whose mission is peace and good will, has been falsely assailed on this floor, and an errand of blameless virtue has been made the pretext for an unpardonable crime. Nay, more—the innocent are sacrificed, and the guilty set at liberty. They who seek to do the mission of the Savior are scourged and crucified, while the murderer, Barabbas, with the sympathy of the chief priests, goes at large. Were I to take counsel of my own feelings, I should dismiss the whole apology to the ineffable contempt which it deserves; but it has been made to play such a part in this conspiracy, that I feel it a duty to express it completely.

## MEN ORGANIZE FOR ALL PURPOSES.

Sir, from the earliest times men have recognized the advantages of organization, as an effective agency in promoting works of peace or war. Especially at this moment there is no interest, public or private, high or low, of charity or trade, of luxury or convenience, which does not seek its aid. Men organize to rear churches and to sell thread; to build schools and to sail ships; to construct roads and to manufacture toys; to spin cotton and to print books; to weave cloths and to quicken harvests; to provide food and to distribute light; to influence public opinion and to secure votes; to guard infancy in its weakness, old age in its decrepitude, and womanhood in its wretchedness; and now, in all large towns, when death has come, they are buried by organized societies, and, emigrants to another world, they lay down in pleasant places, adorned by organized skill. To complain that this prevailing principle has been applied to living emigration, is to complain of Providence and the irresistible tendencies implanted in man.

## SUCH SOCIETIES NO RECENT INVENTION.

But this application of the principles is no recent invention, brought forth for an existing emergency. It has the best stamp of



antiquity. It showed itself in the brightest days of Greece, where colonists moved in organized bands. It became a part of the mature policy of Rome, where bodies of men were constituted expressly for this purpose, *triumviri ad colonis deducendos*—[Liv. xxxvii., § 46.] Naturally it has been accepted in modern times by every civilized State. With the sanction of Spain, an association of Genoese merchants first introduced slaves to this continent. With the sanction of France, the society of Jesuits stretched their labors over Canada and the great lakes to the Mississippi. It was under the auspices of Emigrant Aid Companies, that our country was originally settled, by the Pilgrim Fathers of Plymouth, by the adventurers of Virginia, and by the philanthropic Oglethorpe, whose “benevolence of soul,” commemorated by Pope, sought to plant a free State in Georgia. At this day, such associations of a humbler character, are found in Europe, with offices in the great capital, through whose activity emigrants are aided here.

#### HOW AND FOR WHAT IT WAS ORGANIZED.

For a long time, emigration to the West, from the Northern and Middle States, but particularly from New-England, had been of marked significance. In quest of better homes, annually it has pressed to the unsettled lands, in numbers to be counted by tens of thousands; but this has been done heretofore with little knowledge, and without guide or counsel. Finally, when, by the establishment of a government in Kansas, the tempting fields of that central region were opened to the competition of peaceful colonization, and especially when it was declared that the question of freedom or slavery there, was to be determined by the vote of actual settlers, then at once was organization enlisted as an effective agency in quickening and conducting the emigration impelled thither, and, more than all, in providing homes for it on arrival there. The Company was first constituted under an act of the legislature of Massachusetts, 4th of May, 1854, some weeks prior to the passage of the Nebraska bill. The original act of incorporation was subsequently abandoned, and a new charter received in February, 1855, in which the objects of the Society are thus declared:

“For the purposes of directing emigration westward, and *aiding in providing accommodations for the emigrants after arriving at their place of destination.*”

#### A LIE EXPOSED.

At any other moment, an association for these purposes would have taken its place, by general consent, among the philanthropic experiments of the age; but crime is always suspicious, and shakes, like a sick man, merely at the pointing of a finger. The conspirators against freedom in Kansas now shook with tremor, real or affected. Their wicked plot was about to fail. To help themselves, they denounced the Emigrant Aid Company; and their denuncia-

tions, after finding an echo in the President, have been repeated, with much particularity, on this floor, in the formal report of your committee. The falsehood of the whole accusation will appear in illustrative specimens. A charter is set out, section by section, which, though originally granted, was subsequently abandoned, and it is not in reality the charter of the Company, but is materially unlike it. The Company is represented as "a powerful corporation, with a capital of five millions;" when, by its actual charter, it is not allowed to hold property above one million, and, in point of fact, its capital has not exceeded \$100,000. Then again, it is suggested, if not alleged, that this enormous capital, which I have already said does not exist, is invested in "cannon and rifles, in powder and lead, and implements of war"—all of which, whether alleged or suggested, is absolutely false. The officers of this Company authorize me to give to this whole pretension a point-blank denial. All these allegations are of small importance, and I mention them only because they show the character of the report.

#### ANOTHER LIE EXPOSED.

But these are all capped by the unblushing assertion that the proceedings of the company were "in perversion of the plain provisions of an act of Congress;" and also, another unblushing assertion, as "certain and undeniable," that the company was formed to promote certain objects, "regardless of the rights and wishes of the people, as guarantied by the Constitution of the United States, and secured by their organic law;" when it is certain and undeniable that the company has done nothing in perversion of any act of Congress, while to the extent of its power it has sought to protect the rights and wishes of the actual people in the territory. Sir, this company has violated in no respect the Constitution or laws of the land; not in the severest letter or the slightest spirit. But every other imputation is equally baseless. It is not true, as the Senator from Illinois has alleged, in order in some way to compromise the company, that it was informed before the public of the date fixed for the election of the legislature. This statement is pronounced by the Secretary, in a letter now before me, "an unqualified falsehood, not having even the shadow of a shade of truth for its basis."

#### A BUNCH OF LIES DISPOSED OF.

It is not true that men have been hired by the company to go to Kansas; for every emigrant, who has gone under its auspices, has himself provided the means for his journey. Of course, sir, it is not true, as has been complained by the Senator from South Carolina, with that proclivity to error which marks all his utterances, that men have been sent by the company "with one uniform gun, Sharpe's rifle;" for it has supplied no arms of any kind to anybody. It is not true that the company has encouraged any fanatical aggression upon the people of Missouri; for it has counseled order, peace,



forbearance. It is not true that the company has chosen its emigrants on account of their political opinions; for it has asked no questions with regard to the opinions of any whom it aids, and at this moment stands ready to forward those from the South as well as the North, while, in the territory, all, from whatever quarter, are admitted to an equal enjoyment of its tempting advantages. It is not true that the company has sent persons merely to control elections, and not to remain in the territory; for its whole action, and all its anticipation of pecuniary profits, are founded on the hope to stock the country with permanent settlers, by whose labor the capital of the company shall be made to yield its increase, and by whose fixed interest in the soil, the welfare of all shall be promoted.

#### · NOT AN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

Sir, it has not the honor of being an abolition society, or of numbering among its officers Abolitionists. Its President is a retired citizen of ample means and charitable life, who has taken no part in the conflicts on slavery, and has never allowed his sympathies to be felt by Abolitionists. One of its vice presidents is a gentleman from Virginia, with family and friends there, who has always opposed the Abolitionists. Its generous treasurer, who is now justly absorbed by the objects of the company, has always been understood as ranging with his extensive connections, by blood and marriage, on the side of that quietism which submits to all the tyranny of the slave power. Its Directors are more conspicuous for wealth and science than for any activity against slavery. Among these is an eminent lawyer of Massachusetts, Dr. Chapman,—personally known, doubtless, to some who hear me—who has distinguished himself by an austere conservatism, too natural to the atmosphere of courts, which does not flinch even from the support of the Fugitive Slave Bill. In a recent address at a public meeting at Springfield, this gentleman thus speaks for himself and his associates:

#### MR. CHAPMAN'S TESTIMONY.

“I have been a Director of the Society, from the first, and have kept myself well informed in regard to its proceedings. I am not aware that any one in this community ever suspected me of being an Abolitionist; but I have been accused of being Pro-slavery; and I believe many good people think I am quite too conservative on that subject. I take this occasion to say that all the plans and proceedings of the Society have met my approbation; and I assert that it has never done a single act with which any political party or the people of any section of the country can justly find fault. The name of its president, Mr. Brown, of Providence, and its treasurer, Mr. Lawrence, of Boston, are a sufficient guaranty in the estimation of intelligent men against its being engaged in any fanatical enterprise. Its stockholders are composed of men of all political



parties except Abolitionists. I am not aware that it has received the patronage of that class of our fellow citizens, and I am informed that some of them disapprove of its proceedings."

#### PLANT'S CAPITAL IN ADVANCE OF POPULATION.

The acts of the company have been such as might be expected from auspices thus severely careful at all points. The secret through which, with small means it has been able to accomplish so much, is that *as an inducement to emigration it has gone forward and planted capital in advance of population*. According to the old methodical system, this rule is reversed, and population has been left to grope blindly, without the advantage of fixed centers—with mills, schools and churches—all calculated to soften the hardships of pioneer life—such as have been established beforehand in Kansas. Such, sir, is the secret of the Emigrant Aid Company. By this single principle, which is now practically applied for the first time in history, and which has the simplicity of genius, a business association at a distance, without a large capital, has become a beneficent instrument of civilization, exercising the functions of various societies, and in itself being a Missionary Society, a Bible Society, a Tract Society, an Education Society, and a Society for the Diffusion of the Mechanical Arts. I would not claim too much for this company; but I doubt if, at this moment, there is any society which is so completely philanthropic; and since its leading idea, like the light of a candle from which other candles are lighted without number, may be applied indefinitely, it promises to be an important aid to human progress.

#### THE EXTENT OF ITS LABOR.

The lesson it teaches cannot be forgotten; and hereafter, wherever unsettled lands exist, intelligent capital will lead the way, anticipating the wants of the pioneer—while, amid well-arranged harmonies, a new community will arise, to become by its example a more eloquent preacher than any solitary missionary. In subordination to this essential idea, is its humbler machinery for the aid of emigrants on their way, by combining parties, so that friends and neighbors might journey together; by purchasing tickets at wholesale, and furnishing them to individuals at the actual cost; by providing for each party a conductor familiar with the road, and through these simple means promoting the economy, safety and comfort of the expedition. The number of emigrants it has directly aided, even thus slightly, in their journey, has been indefinitely exaggerated. From the beginning of its operations down to the close of the last Autumn, all its detachments from Massachusetts, contained only thirteen hundred and twelve persons. Such is the simple tale of the Emigrant Aid Company.

## OFFICIAL LAWS OF KANSAS.

## CHAPTER 151.

## SLAVES.

*An Act to punish offenses against Slave property.*

Be it enacted by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Kansas, as follows :

SEC. 1. That every person, bond or free, who shall be convicted of actually raising a rebellion or insurrection of slaves, free Negroes or Mulattoes in this territory, shall suffer death.

SEC. 2. Every free person who shall aid or assist in any rebellion or insurrection of slaves, free Negroes or Mulattoes, or shall furnish arms, or do any overt act in furtherance of such rebellion or insurrection, shall suffer death.

SEC. 3. If any free person shall, by speaking, writing or printing, advise, persuade or induce any slave to rebel, conspire against or murder any citizen of this territory, or shall bring into, print, write, publish or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in the bringing into, printing, writing, publishing or circulating in this territory, any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet or circular, for the purpose of exciting insurrection, rebellion, revolt or conspiracy on the part of the slaves, free Negroes or Mulattoes, against the citizens of the territory, or any part of them, such person shall be guilty of felony and suffer death.

SEC. 4. If any person shall entice, decoy, or carry away out of this territory any slave belonging to another, with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, or with intent to effect or procure the freedom of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, and, on conviction thereof, shall suffer death, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years.

SEC. 5. If any person shall aid or assist in enticing, decoying or persuading, or carrying away or sending out of this territory any slave belonging to another, with intent to procure or effect the freedom of such slave, or with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny and on conviction thereof shall suffer death, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years.

SEC. 6. If any person shall entice, decoy or carry away out of any State or other territory of the United States any slave belonging to another, with intent to procure or effect the freedom of such slave, or with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, and shall bring such slave into this territory, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, in the same manner as if such slave had been enticed, decoyed or carried away out of this territory; and in such case the larceny may be charged to have



been committed in any county of this territory, into or through which such slave shall have been brought by such person, and on conviction thereof, the person offending shall suffer death, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years.

SEC. 7. If any person shall entice, persuade or induce any slave to escape from the service of his master or owner, in this territory, or shall aid or assist any slave in escaping from the service of his master or owner, or shall aid, assist, harbor or conceal any slave who may have escaped from the service of his master or owner, shall be deemed guilty of felony and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than five years.

SEC. 8. If any person in this territory shall aid or assist, harbor or conceal any slave who has escaped from the service of his master or owner, in another State or territory, such person shall be punished in like manner as if such slave had escaped from the service of his master or owner in this territory.

SEC. 9. If any person shall resist any officer while attempting to arrest any slave that may have escaped from the service of his master or owner, or shall rescue such slave when in custody of any officer or other person, or shall entice, persuade, aid or assist such slave to escape from the custody of any officer or other person who may have such slave in custody, whether such slave has escaped from the service of his master or owner in this territory or in any other State or territory, the person so offending shall be guilty of felony, and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than two years.

SEC. 10. If any marshal, sheriff or constable, or the deputy of any such officer, shall, when required by any person, refuse to aid or assist in the arrest and capture of any slave that may have escaped from the service of his master or owner, whether such slave shall have escaped from his master or owner in this territory or any State or other territory, such officer shall be fined in a sum not less than one hundred nor more than five hundred dollars.

SEC. 11. If any person print, write, introduce into, publish or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published or circulated or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing or circulating within this territory any book, paper, pamphlet, magazine, handbill, or circular, containing any statements, arguments, opinions, sentiment, doctrine, advice or innuendo, calculated to produce a disorderly, dangerous or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in this territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority, he shall be guilty of felony, and be punished by imprisonment and [at] hard labor for a term, not less than five years.

SEC. 12. If any free person, by speaking or by writing, assert or maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this territory, or shall introduce into this territory, print, publish, write,



circulate, or caused to be introduced into this territory, written, printed or published or circulated in this territory any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet or circular, containing any denial of the right of persons to hold slaves in this territory, such person shall be deemed guilty of felony and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than two years.

SEC. 13. No person who is conscientiously opposed to holding slaves, or who does not admit the right to hold slaves, in this territory, shall sit as a juror on the trial of any prosecution for any violation of any of the sections of this act.

This Act to take effect and be in force from and after the fifteenth day of September, A. D. 1855.

Copied by the compiler of this volume from the official "Statutes of the Territory of Kansas, passed at the first Session of the Legislative Assembly, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five. Printed in pursuance of the Statute in such case made and provided."

SHAWNEE, M. S. School, 1855.

JOHN T. BRADY, Public Printer.

### SACKING OF LAWRENCE—CONFESSIONS OF AN ENEMY.

We take the following from the *Missouri Republican*. It is from his Kansas correspondent. This correspondent declares himself to be one of the captains of the Law and Order party:

IN CAMP ON THE WAKARUSA, 9 o'clock, May 23, 1856.

#### PARTICULARS OF THE SEIGE OF LAWRENCE.

You will have heard rumors of the movements of the United States Marshal and forces, and will be surprised that I have not posted your readers better. That they were not better posted is explained by the fact that I am Captain of one of the companies under the Marshal, and have made forced marches, and been on piquet duty, as well as having charge of the camp; and for these reasons it will be easy to explain any apparent neglect. For five days and nights I have scarcely slept an hour at a time; indeed, at this moment, it is very hard to keep from going to sleep.

The forces received orders on the evening of Tuesday, the 21st inst., to be in readiness to march at daylight and occupy the heights near Lawrence, which are a branch of what is called the "Back-bone."

The troops were divided into two divisions—those encamped above Lawrence, in and around Lecompton, were the Upper Division, and those encamped in and around Franklin, the Lower. Col. Buford temporarily commanded the latter. Col. T. Titus, late of Florida, and now of Lecompton, had charge of the cavalry, amounting to at least two hundred men, mounted on fine horses, while the U. S. Marshal controlled the whole. Dr. J. H. Stringfellow acted as Colonel of a regiment. Among the cavalry I noticed Gen. G. W. Clark's company, the Doniphan Tigers and the Kickapoo Rangers. It was regretted on all sides that Capt. Martin, of the latter company, was absent on account of the sickness of his wife.

The company from Fort Leavenworth made a good show in the lines. I regret that the names of all the companies, and those of their Captains, are not in my possession.

When the Lower Division arrived on the Heights they found them occupied by the cavalry, which had taken possession of them at three o'clock in the morning. They were relieved by the infantry, and marched to breakfast; when they returned, which was about 12 o'clock, the United States Marshal detailed a posse, who were sent with his deputy into Lawrence to make some arrests. Had they been resisted, as formerly, the army present would have

been called upon for assistance. But they did not resist, as on a previous occasion.

As soon as the deputy and posse returned with the prisoners—some four or five—the troops were dismissed by Col. Adie, acting for Major Donaldson, and were immediately summoned by him for Sheriff Jones to assist in carrying out an order of the United States Court. The Emigrant Aid Hotel and the two printing offices in Lawrence, the *Herald of Freedom* and *Free State*, had been indicted for being nuisances, and the Sheriff ordered to remove them.

It was near four in the afternoon when Jones, though quite weak and much bent from the fatal effects of his wound, entered the town with twenty-five soldiers as an escort. Going up to the "Aid" Hotel, Gen. Pomeroy was called for, and appearing, Jones told him he had come to demand the arms in town, and to destroy the hotel and printing offices, saying that he had five minutes to answer, if he would give up the arms and submit to the destruction mentioned. Which was saying, "you have five minutes to give up or fight." He yielded, without much hesitation, what he said were all the arms they had of which he knew anything. They were a twelve pounder howitzer and three swivels.

That these were all is a lie, no doubt, the rest being concealed. Two hours were then given the proprietors to remove the furniture from the hotel; they refused, and it was taken out by our men. Meanwhile, the Sheriff proceeded to demolish the two printing offices, which was effectually done in a very short time. Most of the type was thrown in Kansas river, and the cases and presses smashed. This was done with less excitement than could have been expected. Indeed, few excesses were committed. Private property was ordered to be respected, and it was respected. There was no liquor in the ranks, and that accounts for the coolness of the citizen-soldiers. It is true that Robinson's house was burnt, but it was contrary to express orders and was done by irresponsible men. Other things were also done, but they were fewer far than it was reasonable to expect.

At the expiration of two hours, the artillery was drawn up in front of the public entrance to the hotel, and a dozen or fifteen shots fired into it, completely riddling the inside and breaking holes in the wall; and after shaking the walls with two or three blasts, the structure was fired, and before the sun went down all that remained of the Aid Hotel was a solitary wall, holding itself up as a warning to the law-breaker, and seeming to say, "Look at me and beware!"

The following are some of the admissions made in the above communication:

1. Col. Adie was acting for Major Donaldson, in dismissing and reassembling the troops for Sheriff Jones. This corroborates the statement made by Mr. Hinman and others, that this was all done under the eye and confessed authority of Marshal Donaldson.

2. That they were "carrying out an order of the United States Court." "The Emigrant Aid Hotel (Free State Hotel) and the two printing offices in Lawrence, the *Herald of Freedom* and the *Free State*, had been indicted for being nuisances and the sheriff ordered to remove them."

3. "Few excesses were committed." We have already an inventory of between 1 and 200,000 dollars worth of property destroyed and stolen. It was our purpose to give a brief history of the preliminaries which led to the sacking of Lawrence and the results somewhat in detail; but the report of the Congressional



Investigating Committee will soon be made and go before the country, so we conclude to omit here any further notice, save to say that all, and more than all, that the free State men have said touching Border Ruffianism, and the complicity of the administration in it, will soon be made manifest, and will be spread before the country.

#### BUCHANAN—HIS PROSPECTS.

We are not among those who think that Buchanan is harder to beat than would be Douglas :

1. He is an *old man*, and an *old fogie* at that, and cannot command the enthusiasm of "*Young America*."

2. He *never* had the element of *personal* popularity.

3. He has been almost everything in politics but a liberty-loving man.

4. He is pledged to the Pierce, Douglas and Calhoun platform, against his own antecedents, his wisest convictions, and is, therefore, in an attitude of pledged hypocrisy, in obedience to the demand of the *black power*.

#### MR. BUCHANAN'S ACCEPTANCE.

One of the political clubs of Philadelphia proceeded to Lancaster to congratulate Mr. Buchanan on his nomination.

That gentleman in acknowledging the compliment spoke as follows :

"Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made you a longer speech, but now *I have been placed upon a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me.* Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, *I must square my conduct according to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it. That platform is sufficiently broad and national for the whole Democratic party.* This glorious party, now more than ever, has demonstrated that it is the true conservative party of the Constitution and of the Union."—*Chicago Journal*, 12th June.

#### HE HAD CONNECTION WITH THE "BARGAIN AND SALE" PLOT AGAINST HENRY CLAY.

At his age, a reversal of all his former views on this slavery question, and uniting himself with the grand conspiracy of Pierce, Douglas and the Southern extremists, against the fundamental principles of our government, is less excusable than it would be in a younger man, and will brand him with disgrace and distrust before the American people.

We copy the following from the *Galena Daily Advertiser* :

JAMES BUCHANAN.—This gentleman is now "*the Democratic*" candidate for the presidency. He was born in Franklin county, Pennsylvania, and studied the profession of law in Lancaster county,

in that State. In 1814 and 1815 he was elected to the State Legislature as a *Federalist*. In that election his opponent, Mr. O. Rogers, *Democrat*, was beaten by about 500 votes. In 1820, Mr. Buchanan was elected to the House of Representatives, and retained his position there for ten years. During this time he was elected four times as a *Federalist*. His vote in those elections and that of his opponents was as follows :

1820.	1824.
James Buchanan, Federal .....4642	James Buchanan, Federal .....3560
Jacob Hibshman, Democrat.....3666	Samuel Houston, Democrat .....3046
1822.	1826.
James Buchanan, Federal .....2753	James Buchanan, Federal .....2700
Jacob Hibshman, Democrat.....1940	Dr. John McCamant, Democrat..2307

In those days Mr. Buchanan was an avowed *Federalist* and opposed Democracy with all the bitterness which characterized that party at that time. In 1829, we find his name appended to the following circular in recommendation of one Mr. Gregg, a candidate for the Pennsylvania legislature. The following is an extract :

“Copy of the circular issued by the *Federalists* of Lancaster in the election campaign of 1829, between Shultz and Gregg :

“We, as *Federalists*, take the liberty of addressing you on the subject of the approaching election for Governor. We wish to communicate our sentiments to you in confidence, and we are anxious that you should call on any of us when you visit Lancaster, and give us your opinion. We wish to be united—we desire both to give and to take counsel.”

JAMES BUCHANAN,	Jasper Slaymaker,	John R. Montgomery,
Robert Coleman,	John Stehman,	James Evans,
Wm. Montgomery,	George Musser,	Emanuel Reigart,
George Ross,	N. Lightner,	Jacob Slough,
John Leonard,	Jasper T. Smith,	John Reynolds,
John Buckman,	Adam Reigart,	Wm. White,
Edward Coleman,	James Carpenter,	Henry Carpenter,
Wm. R. Ross,	George Greaffie,	R. Ober,
George Hambright,	Wm. Norris,	George W. Jacobs.

We refer to the above facts now, in order that this matter about Mr. Buchanan's old original Democracy, may be clearly understood, and no mistake.

Again, in 1825, we hear of Mr. Buchanan as prominently connected with the events of political history, in his connection with the “bargain and sale” plot against Henry Clay, which, perhaps, more than any other shaft of slander ever aimed at him, clouded the prospects of his political life. It will be borne in mind, that the charge against Mr. Clay was, that he voted in the House of Representatives for John Q. Adams for President, in consideration that the latter would appoint him Secretary of State. It will also be borne in mind, that Mr. Buchanan was then the friend and supporter of Gen. Jackson. The facts in the case were no doubt these : A proposition was informally made to Mr. Clay, previous to the election of president, to go into Gen. Jackson's cabinet, should the latter be elected, which election, it was understood, Mr. Clay held



in his own hand. Mr. Buchanan was the bearer of that proposition. In Hayne's Horoscope, of 1847, the part borne by Mr. B. in the transaction is thus set forth :

"Some time in January, 1825, and not long before the election of President of the United States, by the House of Representatives, the Hon. James Buchanan, then a member of the House, and afterwards many years a Senator of the United States from Pennsylvania, who had been a zealous and influential supporter of Gen. Jackson, in the preceding canvass, and was supposed to enjoy his unbounded confidence, called at the lodgings of Mr. Clay, in the city of Washington. Mr. Clay was at that time in the room of his only mess-mate in the House, his intimate and confidential friend, the Hon. R. P. Letcher, since Governor of Kentucky, then also a member of the House. Shortly after Mr. Buchanan's entry into the room, he introduced the subject of the approaching Presidential election, and spoke of the certainty of the election of his favorite, adding that he would form the most splendid cabinet that the country had ever had. Mr. Letcher asked, 'How could he have one more distinguished than that of Mr. Jefferson, in which were both Madison and Gallatin? Where would he be able to find equally eminent men?' Mr. Buchanan replied that 'he would not go out of this room for a Secretary of State,' looking at Mr. Clay. This gentleman (Mr. Clay) playfully remarked that he thought 'there was no timber there fit for a cabinet officer, unless it were Mr. Buchanan himself.' "

"Mr. Clay, while he was so hotly assailed with the charge of bargain, intrigue and corruption, during the administration of Mr. Adams, notified Mr. Buchanan of his intention to publish the above occurrence; but, by the earnest entreaties of that gentleman, he was induced to forbear doing so.

"Several times since the administration of Mr. Adams, it has been intimated to Mr. Buchanan, as we have been informed, that it might be Mr. Clay's imperative duty to publish these facts, but that he was dissuaded from it by Mr. Buchanan.

"To add additional testimony, we state—and let it be denied if it can—that Mr. Clay has now in his possession a letter which, if published to the world, would place Mr. Buchanan in an embarrassing position. The letter comes from Mr. Buchanan; and no call on Mr. Clay will induce him to give it up, save one from his country—*id est* the Senate of the United States."

While Mr. Clay was being pursued with all manner of abuse and detraction on a false charge, Mr. Buchanan, who could have effectually and forever refuted that charge with a single breath by doing him simple justice, stood calmly by and saw him writhe in his sensitive nature, with the poisoned shaft of slander festering in his spirit. We shall not support Mr. Buchanan for the presidency.

#### THE NEW YORK HERALD ON BUCHANAN.

The following prophecies of the N. Y. *Herald* we take from the *Chicago Tribune* of June 10, 1856 :

There is no denying the fact that the N. Y. *Herald* is one of the most sagacious journals in the United States, though wholly destitute of political integrity. It has always managed to be on the winning side in a presidential election. Its prejudices are with the slave-holders; but they have not blinded it from discerning the mighty uprising of the people against the infernal outrages and aggressions of the pro-slavery party upon freedom and the Constitution. It predicts thus early that Buchanan will be defeated. This is ominous. In 1840 the *Herald* predicted early in the campaign

that Van Buren would suffer a tremendous overthrow. In 1844 it differed with almost everybody in declaring that Clay would not be elected. Again in 1848 it boldly asserted that Old Zack. would be the next president. And in 1852 it ventured the opinion that Gen. Scott would be beaten by Pierce. It now insists that Buchanan will be overthrown next fall by the free Kansas party. It says the people are resolved to revolutionize the policy inaugurated by the vacillating, criminal and bloody mal-administration of Pierce, Marcy and Jeff. Davis. And in view of that intense secession ultraism of the Sothern nigger drivers, which has infused itself into all the veins and arteries, the tissues, nerves and bones of the demoralized modern democracy.

The *Herald* proceeds to say: "The main question is, what are the prospects of the campaign? We anticipate one of the most exciting, tumultuous and revolutionary political contests, in all the history of the republic. Many of our hopeful democratic fellow-citizens affect to believe that there will hardly be a fight—that Mr. Buchanan, with hardly a show of resistance, will walk over the course. We have only to say, looking calmly over the whole field, that for all such as entertain the belief that there will be no struggle, the doors of some lunatic asylum had better be left open at once. *We have no doubt of the fact that a vast majority of the American people, in the present distracted condition of the country, are opposed to the democratic party, as debauched and demoralized under malign influence of this Pierce administration; and we believe that there would still exist a majority of the American people opposed to the ratification of the debaucheries of this corrupted party, even if they should nominate as their representative an angel from heaven.* This is our conviction and our belief.

Grant that as an honest man and a statesman, Mr. Buchanan is a fair nomination, and that he is immeasurably superior to men of such small calibre as Pierce and his Forney Kitchen Cabinet, the impressive evidences are yet all around us of an impending revolution. We shall have a revolution—we must have a revolution; for a sweeping revolution is as necessary at times to purify the political atmosphere as is a summer thunder gust to clear away the miasma and corrupting exhalation of a long sickly siege of the dog days.

We say that there is a majority of the American people throughout the Union opposed to the democratic party, as demoralized under the wicked and imbecile administration of Mr. Pierce. Whether the various and incongruous elements, active and passive, which enter into the composition of this majority, can be fused into a practical shape for political action at this time, remains to be seen. The Northern anti-Filmore Know Nothing Convention which meets here on the 12th instant, and the coalition anti-slavery Convention which meets at Philadelphia on the 17th, will have, for this contest, the solution of the problem in their hands.



## SOUTHERN IDEAS OF THE UNION.

The truth is, the North has never been in favor of the dissolution of the Union. The Republicans have never been reckless in their statements about the Union. But slave-holders have been eternally brow-beating by threats of dissolution, and philosophising about its necessity, and believing in its certainty as an ultimate, because they have proceeded upon the ground that slavery is one of the *permanent* institutions of the country. The following extracts are taken from the *N. Y. Times*, and will explain themselves. Let the reader ponder them well and remember that the Southern press teems with similar views and declarations.

"The writer in the *Charleston Mercury*, from whose papers we have quoted sundry opinions on slavery, insists that the preservation of the Union much longer is impossible. He says that all recent legislation has proceeded on the false assumption that the federal constitution was to be maintained. We copy the following from his argument."—*N. Y. Times*, April 25th.

"Why does the South base its statesmanship on the false hopes of restoring the constitution and peace and harmony of the Union, by accomplishing that which is politically impossible by reason of the inherent nature of man? The answer is plain, and I dare to make the answer according to my convictions of the truth. The statesmanship of the South, our method of political thought, our false faith now in the Democratic party, proceed upon the ground that the Union is our centre of thought from which we must reason outward, *and that the Union and the Constitution, and the public liberty with them, can be preserved.*

Now I assert broadly that these premises are erroneous, and the statesmanship and policy based upon them, therefore, cannot be true. *The Constitution itself, in its structure, organism, and aims, is based upon the assumption that a political impossibility will be accomplished in its favor.* The Union if (as?) formed, is based upon the same *fundamental error*, while both proceed upon the additional assumption that they can be preserved, and the public liberty be also preserved with and by them. All these assumptions are founded upon the idea of homogeneity in the people, whose political destiny they are to control, and hence the bright hopes they imparted to lovers of liberty throughout the world during the infancy of the republic. But is it not most apparent that when that homogeneity on which they rest is destroyed, as it has been destroyed, by the most extraordinary national development and increase of population within the limits of the Union, brought about by the influx of heterogenous ethnological elements, contributed by literally all the nations of the earth, to an extent never before known in the annals of human races, then *the principles of the Constitution and the Union do not apply to the new condition of things in the*

*Union*, and that too upon the well established principles of law, which is strongly applicable to the case, that when the reason upon which the law is founded ceases, the law ceases with it."

The succeeding extract is from the *Charleston Standard*.

"While slaves have been excluded, the white race has come upon us. They can no longer come as masters, for the ranks of the masters are full and nearly closed; they must come to offices of labor; in offices of labor they will be in competition with the slave; the competition they must find irksome and repulsive, and, whatever may be the theories on the subject, *it must be the instinct of the white laborer in opposition to the slave, to seek a relief from the severities of that condition.*

"It was to be apprehended, therefore, that from a sudden increase of population under existing laws, *there would be aroused in the ruling race a sentiment of opposition to our institution*; without such increase there was, as we have shown, no possibility of successful competition with the North, in both the fields before us; it was hard to be defeated of equality in the Union and be forced to dissolution to preserve the functions of self-government; it was hard to leave our homes and native States, the subjects of contemptuous speculation, and for this it was that years ago we took the position that "the want of slavery was the *slave trade*," and we have certainly not seen since, the cause for its abandonment. \* \* \*

\* \* \* We believe that the Union will be *temporarily* prolonged by the introduction of slavery into Kansas, but we believe that it might be EXTENDED to an indefinitely distant period, by the restoration of the slave trade. With the certainty of turning the balance of political power, we would have little motive to a dissolution; while the stability and repose of the North from the *predominance of slave power* in the government, would counterbalance any inclination they might have to leave us."

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### *Platforms.*

We present below our State Republican platform, and also the State and National platforms of the Slave Democracy.

PLATFORM OF THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION  
Assembled at Bloomington, Thursday, 29th May, 1856; taken from the *Chicago Democrat*:

Geo. T. Brown, of Madison, presented the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That Stephen A. Douglas, having laid his ruthless hand upon a sacred compact, which "had an origin akin to that of the Constitution, and



which had become canonized in the hearts of the American people," has given the lie to his past history, proved himself recreant to the free principles of this government, violated the confidence of the people of Illinois, and now holds his seat in the Senate chamber, while he misrepresents them.

The committee on resolutions, through O. H. Browning, Esq., made the following report, which was unanimously adopted :

*Whereas*. The present administration has prostituted its powers and devoted all its energy to the propagation of slavery, and to its extension into territories heretofore dedicated to freedom, against the known wishes of the people of such territories; and to the suppression of the freedom of speech and of the press, and to the revival of that odious doctrine of constructive treason, which has always been the resort of tyrants and their most powerful engine of injustice and oppression. *And whereas*, we are convinced that an effort is making to subvert the principles and ultimately to change the form of our government, and which all patriots who love their country and the cause of human freedom, should resist. Therefore

*Resolved*, That foregoing all differences of opinion upon other questions, we pledge ourselves to unite in opposition to the party which upholds and supports it, and to use all honorable and constitutional means to wrest the government from the unworthy hands which now control it, and to bring it back in its administration, to the principles and practices of Washington, Jefferson and their great and good competitors of the Revolution.

*Resolved*, That we hold, in accordance with the opinions and practices of all the great statesmen of all parties, for the first sixty years, the administration of the government, that under the Constitution Congress possesses full power to prohibit slavery in the territories, and that whilst we will maintain all the constitutional rights of the South, that justice, humanity, the principles of freedom as expressed in our Declaration of Independence and our national Constitution, and the purity and perpetuity of our government, require that power should be exerted to prevent the extension of slavery into territories heretofore free.

*Resolved*, That the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was unwise, unjust and injurious, an open and aggravated violation of the plighted faith of the States, and that the attempts of the present administration to force slavery into Kansas against the known wishes of the legal voters of that territory, is an arbitrary and tyrannous violation of the right of the people to govern themselves, and that we will strive by all constitutional means to secure to Kansas and Nebraska the legal guaranty against slavery, of which they were deprived at the cost of the violation of the plighted faith of the nation.

*Resolved*, That we are devoted to the Union, and will to the last extremity defend it against the efforts now being made by the disunionists of the administration to compass its dissolution, and that we will support the Constitution of the United States in all its provisions, regarding it as the sacred bond of our Union, and the only safeguard for the preservation of the rights of ourselves and our posterity.

*Resolved*, That we are in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas as a member of this confederacy, under the constitution adopted by the people of said territory.

*Resolved*, That the spirit of our institutions as well as the Constitution of our country guaranties the liberty of conscience as well as political freedom, and that we will proscribe no one, by legislation or otherwise, on account of religious opinions, or in consequence of place of birth.

*Resolved*, That in Lyman Trumbull, our distinguished Senator, the people of Illinois have an able and consistent exponent of their principles, and that his course in the Senate meets with our unqualified approbation.

Mr. Wentworth, of Cook county, moved that the following be added as an additional plank to the platform :

*Resolved*, That we are in favor of the strictest economy in the administration of the State government, and a faithful application of all its revenues to the liquidation of our State debt, and that the practice of using our State funds for private speculation, whereby a very large defalcation has occurred in our State treasury, cannot be too severely censured, and we therefore take issue with the resolution of the recent convention at Springfield, which endorsed the course of our present Governor. Adopted unanimously.

## STATE PLATFORM OF THE SLAVE DEMOCRACY,

Adopted at the Springfield State Convention, May, 1856; taken from the *Democratic Press*.

### THE NEBRASKA PLATFORM.

The following is the platform adopted by the Nebraska Convention recently assembled in Springfield:

1. *Resolved*, That the Constitution of the United States is a political contract between the people of independent sovereignties, which bestows paramount authority to the extent of the powers delegated to the States respectively or to the people; that a vigilant guard against the centralization of the reserved powers is essential to the preservation of our institutions; and that Congress has no rightful authority to establish, abolish or prohibit slavery in the States and territories.

2. That we affirm the time-honored principles of the Democracy, and believe that the only sure guaranty for the public tranquility is by a strict adherence to the provisions of the Constitution, and by non-intervention upon the subject of slavery, applying alike to the States and territories, observed in the passage of the Compromise measures of 1850, and confirmed in the Kansas and Nebraska act, the corollary of the former measures, by which Congress have declared that it is their true intent and meaning not to legislate slavery into any State or territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States; and that we do pledge ourselves to maintain and execute the Compromise of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave Law, and Kansas and Nebraska act of 1854, as we hold that they are wise and just measures, and should remain undisturbed for the preservation of the national peace, and the union of the States.

3. That the Constitution of the United States is founded upon the fundamental principle of entire and absolute equality among all the States of this Union, and it is not competent for the Congress or any other power to impose upon new States coming into the Union, any condition or restriction in respect to their domestic institutions or internal concerns which the federal constitution has not imposed upon the original States; and that any effort on the part of Congress or any other power to violate this principle, should be resisted by all good citizens, as an attempt to trample upon the Constitution and destroy our Union. That the restriction of the Missouri Compromise would be a flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States, and the principle of self-government, and would be in direct conflict with treaty stipulations and guaranties and the right of the people of the new States to make and alter their constitutions of government and local institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.

4. That all men have a natural right, antecedent to the formation of civil society, and beyond the control of government, to religious freedom, the surrender of which is not necessary to the temporal welfare of the State, and cannot be relinquished even by the consent of the citizen, in a free government; that much less can any mere party of faction regulate that right by any party compact, against his consent, without violating this cardinal principle and the spirit of our Constitution, our laws, and our free government; and that the civil rights, privileges or capacities of any citizen should in no wise be diminished or enlarged on account of his religion.

5. That we do not recognize any distinction among the citizens of the United States based upon the aristocratic principle of birth, and we hold that it is dishonest to repudiate the contract given by the government, conferring all the rights of



American citizenship in letters of naturalization, and afterwards by a party compact to debar naturalized citizens from the full benefits, while we leave them subject to the full burthens of the agreement.

6. That we are opposed and will resist, at the ballot-box and in the legislature. State and national attempts to repeal or alter the naturalization laws of the United States, or to abrogate or restrict the political rights and privileges of any person because of his birth-place, or because of his religious faith, and that the Democratic party recognizes as good American citizens, all those men wherever born or of whatever sectarian creed, who profess and acknowledge the Constitution of the United States as the supreme law of the land, requiring implicit obedience and eternal fidelity to its sacred provisions.

7. That the discussion of public affairs is the foundation of the intelligence of the people and safeguard of freedom; that any secret association, or brotherhood for political objects is dangerous to free institutions, destructive of social confidence, and contrary to the frank and manly character of the true American.

8. That we conceive these principles vital for the maintenance of the Constitution and the integrity of the Union, and that we invoke all patriotic citizens, irrespective of past party opinions, to unite with us for the preservation of the inestimable blessings of civil and religious liberty.

9. That the democracy of Illinois will support and give the electoral vote of this State to the nominee of the Cincinnati convention, without asking whether he come from the North, South, East or West.

10. That the State of Illinois is represented in the Senate of the United States by Stephen A. Douglas, and that he is endeared to the democracy of this State by the manly, daring and undeviating fidelity with which he has always maintained "State sovereignty and national honor," and by his bold and successful assault and exposure of the enemies of the Constitution at home and elsewhere, and we, without a dissenting voice, instruct the delegates from this State to the Cincinnati Convention to vote for him, in case his name should be submitted for the Presidency.

### THE OLD DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM AND WHO DREW IT.

From the *Chicago Democrat* June 14th.

The following\* is one of the resolutions, passed unanimously by the Congressional convention of the democratic party for the district of Illinois, held at Joliet, September 11th, 1850, and published in the *Chicago Democrat* of Sept. 21st, 1850 :

*Resolved*, That we are uncompromisingly opposed to the extension of slavery; and while we would not make such opposition a ground of interference with the interests of the States where it exists, yet we moderately but firmly insist that it is the duty of Congress to oppose its extension to territory now free, by all means compatible with the obligations of the Constitution, and with good faith to our sister States; that these principles were recognized by the ordinance of 1787, which received the sanction of Thomas Jefferson, who is acknowledged by all to be the great oracle and expounder of our faith.

The following gentlemen were upon the committee which reported the above :

Joel A. Matteson, of Will county (present Governor;) E. W. Smith, of McHenry county; Nathan Allen, of Du Page county; John Hise, of La Salle county; P. J. Burchell, of Kane county; A. McWilliams, of McLean county; J. A. Whiteman, of Irqouois, and A. Newton, of Kendall.

### THE BALTIMORE PLATFORM OF JUNE, 1852, REAFFIRMED.

1. *Resolved*, That the American Democracy place their trust in the intelligence, the patriotism, and the discriminating justice of the American people.

2. *Resolved*, That we regard this as a distinctive feature of our political creed, which we are proud to maintain before the world as the great moral element in a form of government springing from and upheld by the popular will; and we contrast it with the creed and practice of federalism, under whatever name or form, which seeks to palsy the will of the constituent, and which conceives no imposture too monstrous for the public credulity.

3. *Resolved, therefore*, That entertaining these views, the Democratic party of this Union, through their delegates assembled in general convention, coming together in a spirit of concord, of devotion to the doctrines and faith of a free representative government, and appealing to their fellow citizens for the rectitude of their intentions, renew and reassert before the American people the declaration of principles avowed by them when, on former occasions, in general convention, they have presented their candidates for the popular suffrages :

1. That the federal government is one of limited powers, derived solely from the Constitution, and the grants of power therein ought to be strictly construed by all the departments and agents of the government, and that it is inexpedient and dangerous to exercise doubtful constitutional powers.

2. That the constitution does not confer upon the general government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvement.

3. That the constitution does not confer authority upon the federal government, directly or indirectly, to assume the debts of the several States, contracted for local and internal improvements or other State purposes, nor would such assumption be just or expedient.

4. That justice and sound policy forbid the federal government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of any other, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen, and every section of the country, has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to complete an ample protection of persons and property from domestic violence or foreign aggression.

5. That it is the duty of every branch of the government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the government, and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.

6. That Congress has no power to charter a national bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power, and above the laws and the will of the people; and that the results of democratic legislation, in this and all other financial measures upon which issues have been made between the two political parties of the country, have demonstrated to candid and practical men of all parties, their soundness, safety and utility in all business pursuits.

7. That the separation of the moneys of the government from banking institutions is indispensable for the safety of the funds of the government and the rights of the people.

8. That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the democratic faith, and every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute books.

9. That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the abolitionists and others made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanence of the Union and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

4. *Resolved*, That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress, and, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by, and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise Measures settled by the last Congress, "the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labor" included; which act, being designed to carry out an express provision of the constitution, cannot, with fidelity thereto, be repealed or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

5. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.



6. *Resolved*, That the proceeds of the public lands ought to be sacredly applied to the national objects specified in the Constitution, and that we are opposed to any law for the distribution of such proceeds among the States, as alike inexpedient in policy and repugnant to the Constitution.

7. *Resolved*, That we are decidedly opposed to taking from the President the qualified veto power, by which he is enabled, under restrictions and responsibilities amply sufficient to guard the public interest, to suspend the passage of a bill whose merits cannot secure the approval of two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, until the judgment of the people can be obtained thereon, and which has saved the American people from the corrupt and tyrannical domination of the Bank of the United States, and from a corrupting system of general internal improvements.

8. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party will faithfully abide by, and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia legislature in 1799; that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

9. *Resolved*, That the war with Mexico, upon all the principles of patriotism and the laws of nations, was a just and necessary war on our part, in which every American citizen should have shown himself on the side of his country, and neither morally nor physically, by word or deed, "have given aid and comfort to the enemy."

10. *Resolved*. That we rejoice at the restoration of friendly relations with our sister republic of Mexico, and earnestly desire for her all the blessings and prosperity which we enjoy under republican institutions; and we congratulate the American people upon the results of that war, which have so manifestly justified the policy and conduct of the Democratic party, and insured to the United States "indemnity for the past, and security for the future."

11. *Resolved*, That, in view of the condition of popular institutions in the old world, a high and sacred duty is devolved with increased responsibility upon the Democratic party of this country, as the party of the people, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State, and thereby the union of the States, and to sustain and advance among us constitutional liberty, by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence to those principles and compromises of the constitution which are broad enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it was, the Union as it is, and the Union as it shall be, in the full expansion of the energies and capacity of this great and progressive people."

#### THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL PLATFORM ADOPTED AT CINCINNATI JUNE 1856.

And Whereas, Since the foregoing declaration was universally adopted by our predecessors in national conventions, and adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively American, it is proper that the American democracy should clearly define its relations thereto, and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called.

*Resolved*, That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in, and its prosperity, expansion, and pre-eminent example in free government built upon, entire freedom in matters of religious concernment, and no respect of person, in regard to rank or place of birth; no party can be justly deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles, which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birth-place. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against Catholics and foreign born, is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged

freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

*Resolved*, That we reiterate, with a renewed energy of purpose, the well-considered declarations of former conventions upon the sectional issue of domestic slavery, and concerning the reserved rights of the States—

1. That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incident steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

2. That the foregoing propositions cover, and was intended to embrace the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress, and therefore the democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise Measures, settled by the Congress of 1850, "the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labor," included; which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot, with fidelity thereto, be repealed or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

3. That the democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

4. That the democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature, in 1790: that it adopts these principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, subsisting exclusively on slavery agitation, now relies to test the fidelity of the people, North or South, to the Constitution and the Union—

1. *Resolved*, That claiming fellowship with and desiring the co-operation of all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue—and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery, which seek to embroil the States and incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the territories; and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion—the American democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the territories of Kansas and Nebraska as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the "slavery question," upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—*Non-interference by Congress with slavery in State and territory, or in the District of Columbia.*

2. That this was the basis of the Compromises of 1850—confirmed by both the democratic and whig parties in national conventions—ratified by the people in the election of 1852—and rightly applied in the organization of territories in 1854.

3. That the uniform application of this democratic principle to the organization of territories, and to the admission of new States with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect—the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact—the original compacts of the Constitution maintained inviolate—and the perpetuity and expansion of this Union insured to its utmost capacity, of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or annexed, with a republican form of government.

*Resolved*, That we recognize the right of the people of all the territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a constitution with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States.

*Resolved*, finally. That in view of the condition of popular institutions in the old world, (and the dangerous tendencies of sectional agitation, combined with the attempt to enforce civil and religious disabilities against the rights of acquiring and enjoying citizenship in our own land)—a high and sacred duty is devolved with increased responsibility upon the Democratic party of this country, as the party of the Union, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State, and thereby the Union of the States; and to sustain and advance among us constitutional liberty, by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence



to those principles and compromises of the Constitution, which are broad enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it was, the Union as it is, and the Union as it shall be, in the full expansion of the energies and capacity of this great and progressive people.

1. *Resolved*, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country which are inferior to no domestic question whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world, and by solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

2. *Resolved*, That our geographical and political position with reference to the other States of this continent, no less than the interest of our commerce and the development of our growing power, require that we should hold as sacred the principles involved in the Monroe doctrine: their bearing and import admit of no misconstruction: they should be applied with unbending rigidity.

3. *Resolved*, That the great highway which nature, as well as the assent of the States most immediately interested in its maintenance, has marked out for a free communication between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, constitutes one of the most important achievements realized by the spirit of modern times and the unconquerable energy of our people.

That result should be secured by a timely and efficient exertion of the control which we have the right to claim over it, and no power on earth should be suffered to impede or clog its progress by any interference with the relations it may suit our policy to establish between our government and the government of the States within whose dominion it lies. We can, under no circumstance, surrender our preponderance in the adjustment of all questions arising out of it.

4. *Resolved*, That, in view of so commanding an interest, the people of the United States cannot but sympathize with the efforts which are being made by the people of Central America, to regenerate that portion of the continent which over-ers the passage across the inter-oceanic isthmus.

5. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party will expect of the next administration that every proper effort be made to insure our ascendancy in the gulf of Mexico, and to maintain a permanent protection to the great outlets through which are emptied into its waters the products raised out of the soil, and the commodities created by the industry of the people of our Western valleys and of the Union at large.

#### NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

The following is an authentic copy of the National Republican Platform adopted at Philadelphia, June 18, 1856. It is a good one, and the people will go for it, and for free speech, free territory, free men and FREMONT:

*Whereas*, This convention of delegates, assembled in pursuance of a call addressed to the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, to the policy of the present administration, to the extension of slavery into free territory: in favor of admission of Kansas as a free State; of the restoring the action of the federal government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson, and for the purpose of presenting candidates for the offices of President and Vice President,

*Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the federal constitution, essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions, the federal constitution and the rights of the States; and that the union of the States shall be preserved.

*Resolved*, That with our republican Fathers we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the undeniable right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that the primary object and ulterior design of our federal government was to secure those rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that, as our republican Fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution, against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing Slavery in

the United States, by positive legislation prohibiting its existence or extension therein; that we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, of any individuals or association, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States, while the present Constitution shall be maintained.

*Resolved*, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of their power, it is both the right and duty of Congress to prohibit in the territories, these twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery.

*Resolved*, That while the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established by the people in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense and secure the blessings of liberty, and contains ample provisions for the protection of life, liberty, and property of every citizen, the dearest constitutional rights of the people of Kansas have been fraudulently and violently taken from them; their territory has been invaded by an armed force, spurious and pretended legislative, judicial and executive officers have been set over them—by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of the government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced; the rights of the people to keep and bear arms have been infringed; test oaths of an extraordinary and entangling nature have been imposed as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage and holding offices; the right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury has been denied; the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, their papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures has been violated; they have been deprived of life, liberty and property without due process of law; that the freedom of speech and the press has been abridged; the right to choose their representatives has been made of no effect; murders, robberies and arson have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished; that all these things have been done with the knowledge, sanction and procurement of the present administration, and that for this high crime against the Constitution, the Union and humanity, we arraign the administration, the president, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists, and accessories, either before or after the facts, before the country and before the world, and that it is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of these atrocious outrages, and their accomplices to a sure and condign punishment hereafter.

*Resolved*, That Kansas should be admitted as a State of the Union with her present free Constitution, as at once the most effectual way of securing to her citizens the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which they are entitled, and of ending the civil strife now raging in her territory.

*Resolved*, That the highwayman's plea, that might makes right, embodied in the Ostend circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

*Resolved*, That a railroad to the Pacific Ocean by the more central and practical route is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country, and that the federal government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction, and, as an auxiliary thereto, the immediate construction of an emigrant route on the line of the railroad.

*Resolved*, That appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors, of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of our existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution and justified by the obligation of government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

*Resolved*, That we invite the affiliation and co-operation of the men of all parties, however different from us in other respects, in support of the principle herein declared, and believing that the spirit of our institutions, as well as the Constitution of our country, guaranties liberty of conscience and equality of rights among the citizens we oppose all legislation impairing their security.



## CHAPTER XII.

## A Summary Statement of the Whole Matter.

The foregoing record settles indubitably the following propositions.

1. That our revolutionary fathers believed in the inalienable rights of *human nature*, to *life, liberty*, and the *pursuit of happiness*.

2. That the war of the revolution was waged in behalf of these *fundamental rights*.

3. That they regarded slavery as an enormous moral and political evil.

4. That while they could not with their views interfere politically with slavery in the States, they did all they could to discourage and blot it out.

5. They would not allow the idea that there could be property in man, to be recognized in the constitution, and promptly ruled the word *slave*, out of it.

6. The State (slave, as well as free) and national courts have always ruled that slavery was contrary to common-law and natural justice, that it is not included in the word "commerce" in the constitution, but is the creation of arbitrary enactments of "positive law."

7. The nation has uniformly acted upon this principle, and has refused to pay for *slaves*, when impressed into the United States service; while it has paid for horses, mules, carts, and other property, it has uniformly refused to pay for *men*.

8. That in 1787 and 1789, the old and the new Congress, the former by enacting the ordinance of '87 and the latter by endorsing it, jointly proclaimed the power of Congress to exclude slavery from, and abolish it in, United States territory.

9. That this power of Congress was never denied to any extent, till after the publication of the Cass-Nicholson letter in '48, nor was it repudiated by the so-called Democratic party, till that party endorsed the infamous Kansas-Nebraska bill in 1854.

10. That while that deceptive and revolutionary bill *seemed*, to secure (and was only designed to *seem* in the North,) the squatters in the territory the right to *exclude* slavery, that in fact it *was designed to do no such thing*.

11. That it endorses the Calhoun doctrine that slavery cannot be interfered with in United States territory by Congress or the squatters, but only by the people of the territory when they come to form a State.

12. That the slave Democracy have in the Illinois State platform, and in the National Cincinnati platform, plumply endorsed this Calhoun dogma, and proclaimed the *crime* of human slavery a *permanent national constitutional* institution.

13. That thus the so-called Democratic party, have repudiated

the Declaration,—the views of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Munroe, and Jackson,—have repudiated that which was the faith of their own party, till within three years,—have become the body guard of 300,000 petty despots,—a purely sectional party, in behalf of a *local, immoral, impolitic, impoverishing, labor-degrading institution*;—a *party for the spread of slave-Negrodom!*

14. That wherever slavery goes it thwarts the great ends of good government. It impoverishes and keeps down the price of land, it hinders emigration, it renders impracticable the common school system, it degrades labor, it begets a personal contempt of labor and the laborer in the privileged class. That when farmers, artisans, blacksmiths, wagon makers, carpenters, joiners, draymen, are bought and sold, *all* who engage in these employments are degraded.

15. That this slave Democracy is now intent on spreading slavery in all our Western territory, that our German, Swiss, Norwegian, and Irish emigrants may have the privilege of working side by side in the same employments, with *Negro slave men and women*.

16. That the design of those who created the Kansas-Nebraska bill, has been carried out in Kansas, by the border ruffians.

17. That Missourians elected the Kansas legislature, and elected Missourians to it, that the laws passed are Missouri laws, and were passed by Missourians; that those laws are so monstrous that no free man can submit to them.

18. That the free State men have all the while showed a most commendable spirit, that they have, in the main, acted right.

19. That in forming a State constitution, throwing themselves back upon their own sovereignty, they have acted rightly and with abundant precedent.

20. That the N. E. E. Aid Society has been most slanderously represented by Douglas and others, and has violated no law, human or divine.

21. That Lawrence has been visited, the Free State Hotel burned, and the two printing presses destroyed, by order of the U. S. Court, and under the authority of a U. S. Deputy Marshal. That this outrage lies at the door of the Administration, and that this U. S. law and order army plundered the city to the tune of from \$100,000 to \$300,000.

*Finally*; that this slave Democracy, blind to the history of the past, and deaf to the warning of the present, seem to know not that there is a God of justice who rules over the affairs of men. That if there is one principle more scientifically settled in the history of the past, and in the foregoing record, than any other, it is—as *a nation sows, it shall reap*. We are now gathering the first fruits of the bloody harvest of our mis-deeds as a people. What shall the end be if we come not back to first principles, and restore the government to its primitive position, nationalizing and fostering liberty, and localizing and discouraging slavery.





# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Preface.....	3
Are all men born with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?...	5

## CHAPTER I.

Calhoun on the American Declaration.....	5
Chancellor Harper, do.....	5
Charleston (S. C.) Mercury, do.....	5
Senator Petit, do.....	5
Douglas &c. &c., do.....	5
Jefferson's original draught of the Declaration.....	5
The American Declaration of Rights.....	6
Rights of Human Nature, by the old Congress.....	6
Jefferson Again.....	7

## CHAPTER II.

Does the Constitution Sanction the Idea of Property in Man?—Outside of Slave States carries and Protects only Liberty.....	7
Slavery can Exist only by Positive Law.....	7
Opinion of Lord Mansfield.....	7
Opinion of Supreme Courts of Mississippi, Missouri, Louisiana.....	8
Word Slave not allowed to pollute the Instrument.....	8
Preamble.....	8
History of the Fifth Article of Amendments to U. S. Constitution.....	8
The Amendment itself.....	9
Contemporaneous Opinions and Declarations—Morris, Ellsworth, Madison, Gerry, Sherman, &c. John Jay, in Federalist—Butler, Pinckney, Wilson, &c.....	9
A Distinguished Living Statesman.....	9
Opinion of Supreme Court, delivered by Justice McLean.....	10
Only Clauses in the Constitution which can be made to Recognize Slavery.....	11
Most Important Opinion of Madison, touching the Power of Congress over Slavery in the States in a Certain Contingency.....	12

## CHAPTER III.

The General Government has uniformly refused to pay for Slaves as Property, till a recent date.....	13
Declaration of the Register of the Treasury.....	13
First Attempt to make Government pay for Slaves, in 1816.....	13
Paid for Horse and Cart, <i>not</i> for <i>Slaves</i> .....	14
Report of Committee, in 1828.....	14
Vote of the House, in '43.....	15

## CHAPTER IV.

The Power of the General Government to Prohibit Slavery in the U. S. Territory never to any extent denied till 1848, and not repudiated by the Democratic Party till '54.....	16
Jefferson's Proviso of 1784.....	16
Ordinance of '87.....	16
Endorsed by the First Congress under the Constitution.....	17
Brief History of the Departure of the Government from its Original Policy, the reason specious.....	18
Monroe's Cabinet.....	19
New Hampshire Democracy.....	19
President Pierce in '45 and '51.....	20
Douglas' Letter about Benton.....	20
Benton, Douglas and Shields.....	21
Henry Clay on Extension.....	21
Daniel Webster in 1848.....	21
Washington on Intervention.....	21



	PAGE.
Attorney General Cushing, in 1836.....	21
Douglas not Abandoned—Prohibitory Policy 7th of January, 1854.....	21
Which Party "Black.".....	22

## CHAPTER V.

Does the Free or Slave Policy further the ends of good government, promote the Intelligence, Dignity and Prosperity of the Free Laborer?.....	22
President Pierce's Charge on Republicans.....	22
Influence of Slavery on Population.....	23
Important Tables.....	25
Bearing of Slavery, on the Value of Land.....	26
Boston against South Carolina.....	26
Manufactures, North and South.....	26
Property of Free and Slave States.....	26
Inventions.....	27
Schools and Illiterate Persons.....	27
Majority of School Directors should know how to Read.....	27
Military Power.....	28

## CHAPTER VI.

Southern Ideas of Liberty—What they Think of the Declaration.....	29
Rich Men and Slave-holders our sole dependence.....	29
Slavery the Law of Nature.....	29
Law Makes Men Property.....	29
God Ordains Slavery—Laborers should be Slaves—What Slave-holders think of Old Line Laborers—White Slaves.....	30
Free Laborers Unfit for Political Officers—The Declaration an Abstraction—Slave-holders American Nobility—Political Power to be taken From Laborers—Slavery the Sheet-anchor of our Liberties—Slavery the Universal Condition of Laborers.....	31
Our own Race saved the degradation of Work.—Every Northern man offers himself for sale. Could anything be Cooler?.....	32

## CHAPTER VII.

The Issue presented and demand made by the Slave Oligarchy.....	33
Charleston News—One of the Southern Gentry—Squatter Sovereignty Repudiated—Power of Congress over Territories—But no power to exclude Slavery—Mark hit.....	34
Issue Conceded—Demand Acknowledged.....	35
Southern View—Brown—Prescott—South Side Democrat—Chase's Amendment—Douglas' recent Report on Kansas Affairs.....	36
All Rights of Territories must come through an Act of Congress—The Springfield Slaveocratic Resolution—The New Faith of so-called Democracy—The Calhoun Doctrine.....	37

## CHAPTER VIII.

Bearing of Slavery on Non-Slave-holders of the South—Poor Whites of the South—Degraded but Growing Worse.....	38
The Upheaving of our Masses—How they obtain a Precarious Subsistence.....	39
Glad to Work for half-price—The number that don't Work—School Fund—Waste of Money—A Step in Advance of the Indian—Christianizing our poor Whites.....	40
Our Half-fed, Half-clothed Whites—The Poor White Man will endure the evils of Pinching Poverty rather than work beside the Negro—One Master grasps the whole Domain.....	41

## CHAPTER IX.

Kansas—Invasion of.....	42
Elections carried by the Border Ruffians, by persons out of Kansas—Free State Party Statement.....	43
Slave State Party Statement.....	44
Case Summed Up.....	45
Known by their Fruits.....	46 & 47
More Proof.....	48
Inconsistency of President Pierce—Dorr Rebellion.....	49
Pierce's Congratulatory Speech—Resolutions—Hale's Application.....	50
A Precedent for the Free State Convention in the case of Michigan.....	51
Vote of Pierce, Buchanan, Benton, Silas Wright, &c.—Cass in heart favorably inclined to the Free State Men—Qualifications for voting in Kansas.....	52 & 53

## CHAPTER X.

Emigrant Aid Society—The Society Assailed—Men organize for all Purposes—Such Societies no recent Invention.....	54
How and for What it was Organized—A Lie Exposed.....	55
Another Lie Exposed—A Bach of Lies Disposed of.....	56
Not an Abolition Society—Mr. Chapinan's Testimony.....	57
Plants Capital in Advance of Population—The Extent of its Labors.....	58
Official Laws of Kansas—An Act to punish offenses against Slave Property—Six cases punished with Death.....	59

	PAGE.
Worse and Worse.....	60
A man must be a theoretical Villain to sit as a Juror—Sacking of Lawrence—Confessions of an Enemy.....	61 & 62
Buchanan—his Prospects—Easier beaten than would be Douglas—Square on the Platform	63
Bargain and Sale plot against Henry Clay.....	63, 64 & 65
Prophecies of the New York Herald.....	65 & 66
Southern Ideas of the Union.....	67

## CHAPTER XI.

Platforms.....	68
Platform of Illinois Republican State Convention.....	69
Illinois State Platform of the Slave Democracy.....	70
The Old Democratic Platform of the Congressional Democratic Convention held at Joliet Sept. 11, 1850.....	71
The Baltimore Platform of June 1852, Reaffirmed.....	71, 72 & 73
The Democratic National Platform adopted at Cincinnati June 1856.....	73, 74 & 75
National Republican Platform, adopted at Philadelphia June 18, 1856.....	75 & 76

## CHAPTER XII.

A Summary Statement of the Whole Matter.....	77 & 78
Contents.....	80, 81 & 82





Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.  
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide  
Treatment Date: May 2010

## **PreservationTechnologies**

**A WORLD LEADER IN COLLECTIONS PRESERVATION**

111 Thomson Park Drive  
Cranberry Township, PA 16066  
(724) 779-2111





